

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Sidney R. Bader	Charles H. Knowles
William T. Baldwin	Richard L. Kussman
Roy L. Belli	Earl P. Lovell
Joseph A. Como	Michael Mura
William D. Conroy	Paul V. Murphy
Raymond F. Fitzsimmons	Roy I. Parker
John A. Fullinwider	Donald D. Robinson
George M. Garner	Hosea E. Taylor
Louis Gasparine, Jr.	Joseph F. Taylor, Jr.
Thomas J. Gipson, Jr.	Dwight R. Timmons
Edward E. Grebenstein, Jr.	Raymond D. Walters
Thomas G. Henry	John L. White
William D. Hubbard	Loren G. Witty
Thomas W. Jones	Richard H. Young

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Russell W. Adamczuk	James F. Newell
James E. Anderson	John T. Nichols
Harry H. Blair	William H. Nulty
Eugene A. Bambic	John P. Oliver
David L. Battaglia	George E. Owings
Kenneth E. Baublitz	Donald C. Pauley
William V. Bicknel	John A. Sebring
Donald C. Bieger	Franklin R. Shoemaker
Joseph J. Bischoff	James D. Shubert
Ira Blalock, Jr.	William P. Shunkley, Jr.
George A. Candea	Craig H. Stephenson
Robert L. Carlisle	Donald E. Sudduth
Leroy R. Cates	Robert A. Utter
Robert E. Cleveland	Ralph V. Walker, Jr.
Jack L. Cole	Frank V. Weiler
James L. Cooper	Richard C. White
Jerry J. S. Crittenden	Carl A. Zimmerman
John G. Fifield	III
Clarence D. Foreman	Miguel E. Bustamante, Jr.
Jerald L. Frandsen	Michael P. Cady
Donald R. Gerber	Arthur B. Carr, Jr.
Clarence B. Grey	Bruce W. Emberton
Harold J. Horan, Jr.	Edwin B. Henson, Jr.
Ernest P. Lewis, Jr.	Raymond C. Lafser
Frank W. Martino	Charles P. Williams
Andrew G. Marushok	
Ronald A. Mason	
James F. McNellis	
Harry L. Mills	

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of June 11), 1956:

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Frederick O. Mercer, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Illinois.

Frederick Van Pelt Bryan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, June 13, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Ralph Silverstein, spiritual leader of Temple Sinai (the Arlington Temple), Brooklyn, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Lord of the universe, Father of all mankind, bless, we pray Thee, the distinguished Members of this great deliberative body—the House of Representatives.

Bless our ailing President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and grant that he may enjoy a speedy and complete recovery.

In this hour of continuing world crisis, O Lord, when the dark clouds of hydrogen war continue to hover so menacingly overhead and when the very fate of civilization itself seems to tremble in the balance, we are deeply stirred and heartened by the knowledge that in our beloved land and elsewhere throughout the world men of all faiths are turning to Thee in ever greater numbers. For in the face of global events and movements so overwhelming in their very magnitude and complexity, we are but as helpless children groping for Thy light and Thy salvation. But Thy divine spirit, O God, moves within us in ways which passeth understanding. There are great and gifted men in this our Government, in this our House of Representatives. Inspire them, O Heavenly Father—enlarge their vision. Fill them with a holy zeal and a crusading spirit to bring the blessings of true brotherhood to our own beloved America so that none may be demeaned as second-class citizens, whatever be their faith or their race, for all are truly Thy children and Thou are our Father.

Make them unfailingly mindful that in many ways Washington is the capital of the world, that whatever is said and done here literally affects the very fate of mankind. Grant us the strength, the wisdom, and the determination to banish forever the dread scourge of war from the face of the earth and ordain, we beseech Thee, that our sorely troubled world may at long last enjoy Thy sweet blessings of universal peace and brotherhood under Thine all-embracing fatherhood, O God. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### VOTE TO RECOMMIT H. R. 5881

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, when you vote today on the most-favored 17 States in the Northwest legislation, conference report on H. R. 5881, small-projects legislation, vote to recommit this bill. Because you are voting a \$100 million authorization to these 17 most-favored States to the exclusion of 31 other States which were included in the legislation; but after the conferees got through with H. R. 5881, these 31 States were excluded. The only participation the States in the East and the South will enjoy in this legislation—if it can be called enjoyment—is that your constituents will be called upon to pay the taxes to pay the \$100 million incorporated in the bill in the report for the benefit of the 17 most-favored States. Vote to recommit the conference report.

#### FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Folsom, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have just introduced legislation designed to carry out the first recommendation of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School which he recently appointed. It would authorize the appropriation of \$800,000 for grants to the States to encourage the States to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school to conduct studies and conferences and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies to meet our pressing problems related to higher education.

Our Nation cannot afford to lapse into a situation of desperation with respect to higher education. I commend the President of the United States for his insistence that there be advanced planning so that we can avert a crisis in higher education. My bill would carry out the President's, the administration's policy. The best explanation is set forth in a letter from Mr. Folsom to Speaker RAYBURN which is here set forth:

DEPARTMENT OF  
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
Washington, June 11, 1956.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school.

The draft bill would authorize the appropriation of \$800,000, to be available until June 30, 1958, for grants to the States on the basis of their respective populations, in order to encourage and assist each State to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school, which committee, through studies and conferences, would consider educational problems beyond the high school and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies at local, State, regional, and Federal levels. States would be required, through their Governors, to undertake to use grants solely for the purposes of the act and to have their State committees submit reports to the Commissioner of Education for use of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

You will recall that the President in his special message to the Congress on January 12, 1956, expressed his concern about the growing problems in the field of education beyond the high school and indicated that he would appoint a committee to develop proposals in this field, as follows:

"Shortages now exist in medicine, teaching, nursing, science, engineering, and in other fields of knowledge which require education beyond the level of the secondary school. Changing times and conditions create new opportunities and challenges. There are now possibilities for older persons, properly trained, to lead more productive and rewarding lives. The tide of increasing school enrollment will soon reach higher educational institutions. Within 10 years we may expect 3 students in our colleges and universities for every 2 who are there now.

"Higher education is and must remain the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions. But to lay before us all the problems of education beyond high school, and to encourage active and systematic attack on them, I shall ap-

point a distinguished group of educators and citizens to develop this year, through studies and conferences, proposals in this educational field. Through the leadership and counsel of this group, beneficial results can be expected to flow to education and to the Nation, in the years ahead."

Composition of the committee was announced April 19 and on April 27 it met, organized, and agreed on basic objectives as follows: First, to collect, assemble, and disseminate information for the purpose of increasing public awareness of the vast challenge which lies ahead in the field of education beyond the high school; second, to encourage the planning and action which must now be undertaken by institutions and groups of institutions, locally and nationally, publicly and privately, to meet the impending demands upon our educational system; the third, to advise the President as to the proper role of the Federal Government in this field and to recommend appropriate Federal policies and relationships.

In order to provide immediate stimulus to the initiation of widespread planning, studies, and action which should be undertaken now by institutions, States, and localities, the committee recommended the provision of one-time grants to the States to encourage and assist each State to establish a State committee on education beyond the high school. These State counterparts to the national committee are essential not only for coordination of study and planning activities in the States but to provide a nationwide mechanism for liaison with the national committee. The instant draft bill is designed to accomplish these objectives.

This Department shares with the Committee on Education Beyond the High School and with the educational leadership of the Nation, the great concern we all have about the necessity of bringing concerted action to bear on the mounting problems which we foresee ahead in this field of education and in meeting our future manpower needs. We are, therefore, in accord with the recommendation of the committee.

I shall appreciate it if you would refer the draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,  
Secretary.

#### PROSPERITY OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a clipping from the Longmont Times-Call, Longmont, Colo., which clearly indicates the prosperity of the State of Colorado. Income-tax collections are a definite barometer of the economic conditions of business interests. It is worth reading and answers some of the arguments of those who would have you believe we are on the verge of a depression.

STATE INCOME TAX COLLECTIONS \$2½ MILLION AHEAD

DENVER.—Colorado State income tax collections are \$2,500,000 ahead of the first 5 months of last year, Revenue Director Earl Blevins reported Friday.

He said receipts for the first 5 months of 1956 totaled \$20,987,591, compared with \$18,403,749 for the same 1955 period.

Income-tax receipts for all of 1955 amounted to \$26,203,286.

Blevins said the department has processed 470,661 returns so far this year, as compared with 423,684 for the first 5 months of last year. Approximately 100,000 returns remain to be processed, he added.

The total number of returns last year was 500,847.

#### REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Friday to file their report on the bill H. R. 11742.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to recommit the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects, and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

Without objection the Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

The was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SAYLOR moves to recommit the conference report to the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 10, noes 32.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 209, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—179

Abbott	Bowler	Cunningham
Alexander	Bray	Curtis, Mass.
Andresen,	Brown, Ohio	Dague
August H.	Brownson	Davis, Ga.
Arends	Broyhill	Davis, Wis.
Ashley	Bush	Derounian
Ashmore	Byrne, Pa.	Devereux
Auchincloss	Byrnes, Wis.	Dondro
Barrett	Canfield	Donohue
Bass, N. H.	Cannon	Donovan
Bates	Carlyle	Dorn, N. Y.
Baumhart	Carrigg	Durham
Beamer	Cederberg	Feighan
Becker	Chelf	Fenton
Bennett, Mich.	Chipperfield	Fino
Bentley	Chudoff	Flood
Betts	Church	Flynt
Boggs	Clark	Ford
Bolton,	Clevenger	Forrester
Frances P.	Cole	Fountain
Bolton,	Colmer	Frelinghuysen
Oliver P.	Corbett	Fulton
Bonner	Coudert	Gary
Bosch	Cramer	Gavin
Bow	Cretella	

Gray	Latham	Sadlak
Green, Pa.	LeCompte	St. George
Gregory	Long	Saylor
Gross	McCulloch	Schenck
Gwinn	McGregor	Scherer
Haley	McVey	Schwengel
Hand	Macdonald	Seely-Brown
Harden	Martin	Sheehan
Hardy	Meador	Short
Harrison, Va.	Morrow	Shuford
Henderson	Miller, Md.	Siler
Heselton	Minshall	Simpson, Ill.
Hess	Morano	Smith, Miss.
Hoeven	Moulder	Smith, Va.
Holland	Mumma	Smith, Wis.
Hull	Nicholson	Taber
Hyde	O'Neill	Talle
James	Osners	Taylor
Jenkins	Ostertag	Thompson,
Jennings	Patterson	Mich.
Jensen	Perkins	Tuck
Johansen	Philbin	Van Zandt
Jonas	Pilcher	Vorys
Jones, Mo.	Pillion	Vursell
Jones, N. C.	Poff	Walter
Judd	Polk	Watts
Kean	Preston	Wharton
Kearney	Quigley	Whitten
Kearns	Radwan	Widnall
Keating	Ray	Wigglesworth
Kilburn	Reece, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
King, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Knox	Riehlman	Willis
Laird	Robeson, Va.	Winstead
Landrum	Robson, Ky.	Wolcott
Lanham	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton

NAYS—209

Abernethy	Frazier	Morgan
Adair	Friedel	Moss
Addonizio	Garmatz	Multer
Albert	Gathings	Murray, Ill.
Alger	Gentry	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, Calif.	Gordon	Natcher
Andrews	Grant	Norblad
Anfuso	Green, Oreg.	Norrell
Aspinall	Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.
Avery	Gubser	O'Brien, N. Y.
Ayres	Hagen	O'Hara, Ill.
Bailey	Harris	O'Konski
Baker	Harrison, Nebr.	Passman
Baldwin	Harvey	Pelly
Barden	Hays, Ark.	Pfost
Bass, Tenn.	Hayworth	Phillips
Belcher	Healey	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Powell
Berry	Herlong	Price
Blatnik	Hiestand	Priest
Blitch	Hill	Rabaut
Boland	Hillings	Rains
Bolling	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Boykin	Holmes	Reuss
Boyle	Holt	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks, La.	Holtzman	Riley
Brooks, Tex.	Hope	Roberts
Brown, Ga.	Hosmer	Rodino
Buckley	Huddleston	Rogers, Colo.
Budge	Ikard	Rogers, Fla.
Burdick	Jarman	Rogers, Tex.
Burleson	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney
Burnside	Johnson, Wis.	Roosevelt
Byrd	Jones, Ala.	Rutherford
Celler	Karsten	Scrivner
Chase	Kee	Sudder
Chatham	Kelly, N. Y.	Selden
Chenoweth	Keogh	Shelley
Coon	Kilday	Sheppard
Cooper	Kilgore	Sieminski
Crumpacker	King, Calif.	Sikes
Curtis, Mo.	Kirwan	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Spence
Dawson, Ill.	Kluczynski	Springer
Dawson, Utah	Knutson	Staggers
Deane	Krueger	Steed
Delaney	Lankford	Sullivan
Dempsey	Lesinski	Teague, Calif.
Denton	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Dies	Lovre	Thomas
Dingell	McCarthy	Thompson, N. J.
Dixon	McCormack	Thompson, Tex.
Dollinger	McDonough	Thomson, Wyo.
Dorn, S. C.	McDowell	Tollefson
Doyle	McIntire	Trimble
Edmondson	Mack, Ill.	Tumulty
Elliott	Mack, Wash.	Udall
Ellsworth	Madden	Utt
Engle	Magnuson	Vanik
Evins	Mahon	Van Pelt
Fallon	Maillard	Velde
Fascell	Marshall	Vinson
Fernandez	Matthews	Wainwright
Fisher	Metcalf	Weaver
Fjare	Miller, Nebr.	Wier
Fogarty	Mills	Williams, N. J.
Forand	Mollohan	Wilson, Calif.



Wilson, Ind.  
Withrow  
Wright

Yates  
Young  
Younger

Zablocki  
Zelenko

## NOT VOTING—44

Allen, Ill.	Halleck	Morrison
Andersen,	Hays, Ohio	Nelson
H. Carl	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Bell	Hoffman, Mich.	Patman
Carnahan	Hollifield	Prouty
Christopher	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cooley	Jackson	Richards
Davidson	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Diggs	Lane	Scott
Dolliver	McConnell	Simpson, Pa.
Dowdy	McMillan	Sisk
Eberharter	Machrowicz	Thompson, La.
Gamble	Mason	Thornberry
George	Miller, Calif.	Westland
Hale	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Westland against.  
Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Horan against.  
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Carnahan against.  
Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Hollifield against.

Mr. Hale for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Prouty for, with Mr. Cooley against.  
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Sisk against.  
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Davidson against.  
Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Allen of Illinois.  
Mr. McMillan with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.  
Mr. Patman with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.  
Mr. Wier with Mr. George.  
Mr. Richards with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. RABAUT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. QUIGLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BELCHER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MERROW changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEAMER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHENOWETH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KIRWAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PERKINS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.  
Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this legislation plugs the gap in our present water conservation program. Prior

to 1902, the pioneer residents of the arid western States had constructed on their own just about all of the reclamation projects that could be financed without assistance in the form of loans from the Government. The passage of the Reclamation Act of 1902 recognized that fact. Since that time, the Federal Government through the Bureau of Reclamation has made additional funds available on a repayable basis. This has enabled the rapidly growing West to meet its current water requirements.

There is an area, however, where an additional program is needed. Local financing takes care of the projects under \$1 million. The Bureau of Reclamation program in the past has furnished the engineering know-how for the larger multipurpose projects. But in each of the western reclamation States there are feasible projects in the \$1 million to \$5 million class. The extensive engineering and supervision required for Bureau construction makes it uneconomical at the present time for these smaller projects to be constructed under present law. However, if funds were available for non-interest loans, and if the local sponsoring groups could furnish the engineering data and supervision, many fine, feasible projects would be built. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Much has been said about this being a special bill for a special region. That is true. What is being overlooked, however, is the basic reason for our reclamation act. The Federal Government, for example, owns over 70 percent of the land area of my State of Utah. We cannot tax this area. The major portion of the revenues from users of the area go into a special reclamation fund. Ten percent of the revenues go into the Federal Treasury.

Legislation establishing a program of development restricted to these 17 public land States is no more regional than legislation establishing beach control projects and rivers and harbor improvement. And let it be remembered, that the reclamation States repay the Treasury the cost of the project—a rather unique penalty we pay for having too little, rather than too much water.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the motion to recommit the bill (H. R. 4090) amending the Communications Act of 1934.

Without objection, the Clerk will read the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PELLY moves to recommit H. R. 4090 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

1. For the purpose of bringing about evaluation of reliability of device under actual operational conditions of sufficient variety and duration to determine value of the device for safety purposes;

2. To bring in line with international procedures and criteria for safety and distress; and

3. For purpose of determining alternative and more reliable methods of accomplishing the purposes of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 151, nays 228, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—151

Adair	Dixon	Morrow
Alger	Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Md.
Allen, Calif.	Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.
Andersen,	Fjare	Minshall
August H.	Ford	Mumma
Andrews	Frelinghuysen	Nicholson
Arends	Gentry	Norblad
Ashley	Grant	Osmer
Ashmore	Gross	Ostertag
Auchincloss	Gubser	Pelly
Avery	Hand	Phillips
Ayres	Harrison, Nebr.	Pilcher
Bass, N. H.	Harvey	Poff
Bates	Henderson	Preston
Baumhart	Hess	Prouty
Beamer	Hiestand	Ray
Becker	Hillings	Robeson, Va.
Belcher	Hinshaw	Robson, Ky.
Bennett, Mich.	Hoeven	St. George
Bentley	Holmes	Scherer
Berry	Holt	Servner
Betts	Hosmer	Scudder
Bolton,	Hyde	Siler
Frances P.	James	Simpson, Ill.
Bolton,	Jenkins	Smith, Kans.
Oliver P.	Jensen	Smith, Wis.
Bosch	Johansen	Taber
Bow	Johnson, Calif.	Talle
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Taylor
Budge	Jones, N. C.	Teague, Calif.
Bush	Judd	Thompson,
Byrnes, Wis.	Kean	Mich.
Cederberg	Kearns	Thomson, Wyo.
Chase	Keating	Tollefson
Chatham	Kilburn	Tuck
Chiperfield	Kilgore	Utt
Church	King, Pa.	Van Felt
Clevenger	Knox	Velde
Cole	Krueger	Vorys
Coon	Laird	Vursell
Coudert	Landrum	Wainwright
Cramer	Latham	Weaver
Crumpacker	LeCompte	Wharton
Cunningham	Lipscomb	Widnall
Curtis, Mass.	Lovre	Wigglesworth
Curtis, Mo.	McDonough	Williams, N. Y.
Dague	McVey	Wilson, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	Mack, Wash.	Wilson, Ind.
Davis, Wis.	Magnuson	Wolcott
Dawson, Utah	Mailliard	Young
Derounian	Marshall	Younger
Devereux	Meador	

NAYS—228

Abbitt	Carlyle	Fernandez
Abernethy	Carrigg	Fino
Addonizio	Celler	Fisher
Albert	Chelf	Flood
Alexander	Chenoweth	Flynt
Anfuso	Chudoff	Fogarty
Aspinall	Clark	Forand
Bailey	Colmer	Forrester
Baker	Cooper	Fountain
Baldwin	Corbett	Frazier
Barden	Cretella	Friedel
Barrett	Davis, Tenn.	Fulton
Bass, Tenn.	Dawson, Ill.	Garmatz
Bennett, Fla.	Deane	Gary
Biatnik	Delaney	Gathings
Blich	Dempsey	Gavin
Boggs	Denton	Gordon
Boland	Dies	Gray
Bolling	Dingell	Green, Oreg.
Bowler	Dodd	Green, Pa.
Boyle	Dollinger	Gregory
Bray	Dondero	Griffiths
Brooks, La.	Donohue	Hagen
Brooks, Tex.	Dorn, N. Y.	Haley
Brown, Ohio	Doyle	Harden
Brownson	Durham	Hardy
Broyhill	Edmondson	Harris
Burdick	Elliott	Harrison, Va.
Burleson	Engle	Hays, Ark.
Burnside	Evins	Hayworth
Byrd	Fallon	Hébert
Byrne, Pa.	Fascell	Herlong
Canfield	Feighan	Heseltun
Cannon	Fenton	Hess

Hollifield	Morgan	Saylor
Holland	Moss	Schenck
Holtzman	Moulder	Seely-Brown
Hope	Multer	Selden
Huddleston	Murray, Ill.	Sheehan
Hull	Murray, Tenn.	Shelley
Ikard	Natcher	Sheppard
Jarman	Norrell	Short
Jennings	O'Brien, Ill.	Shuford
Johnson, Wis.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sieminski
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Ill.	Sikes
Jones, Mo.	O'Konski	Smith, Miss.
Karsten	O'Neill	Smith, Va.
Kearney	Passman	Spence
Kee	Patterson	Springer
Kelly, N. Y.	Perkins	Staggers
Keogh	Pfost	Steed
Kilday	Philbin	Sullivan
King, Calif.	Pillion	Teague, Tex.
Kirwan	Poage	Thomas
Klein	Polk	Thompson, N. J.
Kluczynski	Powell	Thompson, Tex.
Knutson	Price	Trimble
Lanham	Priest	Tumulty
Lankford	Quigley	Udall
Lesinski	Rabaut	Vanik
Long	Radwan	Van Zandt
McCarthy	Rees, Kans.	Vinson
McCormack	Reuss	Walter
McCulloch	Rhodes, Pa.	Watts
McDowell	Riehlman	Whitten
McGregor	Riley	Wier
Macdonald	Roberts	Williams, Miss.
Machrowicz	Rodino	Williams, N. J.
Mack, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	Willis
Madden	Rogers, Fla.	Winstead
Mahon	Rogers, Mass.	Withrow
Matthews	Rogers, Tex.	Wolverton
Metcalf	Rooney	Wright
Mills	Roosevelt	Yates
Mollohan	Rutherford	Zablocki
Morano	Sadiak	Zelenko

## NOT VOTING—53

Allen, Ill.	Gwinn	Morrison
Andersen,	Hale	Nelson
H. Carl	Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.
Bell	Hays, Ohio	Patman
Bonner	Healey	Rains
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Carnahan	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Christopher	Jackson	Richards
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Davidson	Lane	Schwengel
Diggs	McConnell	Scott
Dolliver	McIntire	Simpson, Pa.
Donovan	McMillan	Sisk
Dowdy	Martin	Thompson, La.
Eberharter	Mason	Thornberry
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Westland
George	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Carnahan against.  
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Morrison against.  
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Buckley against.  
Mr. George for, with Mr. Davidson against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Healey against.  
Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Westland for, with Mr. Sisk against.  
Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Donovan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Allen of Illinois.  
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.  
Mr. Boykin with Mr. McIntire.  
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Nelson.  
Mr. Patman with Mr. Hale.  
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.  
Mr. Cooley with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Christopher with Mr. Schwengel.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.  
Mr. Richards with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. CANFIELD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BROYHILL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WOLVERTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CRETELLA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 10964.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EVERY AMERICAN IS ENTITLED TO A FAIR MINIMUM WAGE AND DECENT STANDARD OF LIVING

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, early in January of last year I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to \$1.35. Some of my colleagues were of the opinion my proposed hourly rate of pay was too high, but I did not because I had first-hand knowledge of the substandard wages many of my friends and constituents in South Philadelphia were receiving. And believe me they earned every penny they made because the work was not easy and in most cases none too pleasant.

Nevertheless, since I could not obtain the full support of the committee or the House for my bill, I reluctantly agreed to support and vote for the \$1 hourly minimum wage because I have learned through my 10 years' of experience here in Washington that "if you can't fight the foe and win, join them." I also remembered the trite phrase, "half a loaf is better than none."

Mr. Speaker, this coming Saturday, June 16, 1956, marks the 18th anniversary of one of the most outstanding pieces of legislation ever enacted by the Congress under the leadership of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Eighteen years ago Congress passed a law which made it the policy of the Government of the United States to eliminate substandard wages. Since the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act, this Nation has enjoyed years of prosperity and economic growth. Nevertheless, the Congress has been entirely too silent in making effective the legisla-

tion it has enacted in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Despite the increases in Federal minimum wages last year, I still find the mandatory minimum wage unrealistic and wanting. It was my firm conviction last year when the Congress passed the \$1 minimum that it was utterly inadequate. With the passage of another year the new minimum of \$1 has become even more obsolete.

Early next year when the 85th Congress convenes, I shall introduce a bill to raise the present \$1 minimum to \$1.50. I feel this action on my part will be more effective at that time since the present 84th Congress is now rushing toward adjournment within the next few weeks. I certainly do not wish to have the bill pigeonholed or hastily considered by the Committee on Education and Labor because of its vital importance to all working Americans. I submit that this proposed minimum is absolutely necessary if Congress is to attempt to make meaningful the law of the land which aims at eliminating substandard wages.

Studies by the United States Department of Labor indicate that a worker must earn more than \$2 an hour and work steadily for 52 weeks a year in order to support a family of four with a minimum decent standard of living. Even a single woman without dependents requires, according to independent studies made by several State agencies, between a minimum of \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year to maintain a minimum decent standard of living.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, the minimum annual budget requirements of a single woman are estimated to be \$2,400. This means that a woman working 50 weeks at 40 hours would require at least \$1.20 an hour to earn the minimum requirements. That does not allow for any lay-offs, sicknesses, or other emergencies; and we know that most of the poorer paying jobs rarely offer steady employment. Thus, assuming that a single lady works 40 weeks during the year and 40 hours a week, she would require exactly \$1.50 to maintain a dignified, though very modest, living.

I am also greatly concerned with the millions of workers who have been completely denied the benefits and protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act. At present, many of the giant corporations of the country are exempt from paying their employees a minimum wage and are also not subject to payment of overtime rates. This is true in the retail trade where some of the exempt companies are doing a billion-dollar business during the year. Some of our most luxurious hotels in the Nation are also paying many of their employees below subsistence wages. The same is true of the giant agricultural establishments—I am not referring to small farms but to the factories in the field that employ many farmhands—which very frequently pay starvation wages. Similarly, employees of small telephone companies, laundries, local transit companies, construction, wholesaling, finance, insurance, and real estate are entitled to receive at least the minimum wages which are mandatory in other businesses under Federal law.



I believe that all employees in our great country are entitled to fair treatment, and the Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to these millions of unprotected workers.

It is my firm conviction that the Nation's economy can well afford to carry the proposed higher minimum wage. As a matter of fact, I believe that it can ill afford not to do so. The economy is still, by and large, prosperous; but many dangerous soft spots are appearing and this is the case in Philadelphia, which is classified as a distressed labor area. We have been confronted with a serious and continuing unemployment problem for many years. As of January 1956, according to the United States Employment Service, the rate of unemployment in the city of Philadelphia was 6.3 percent. The national average was 4.4 percent. Additional income received by millions of workers would protect and support the prosperity and make it possible to achieve a higher level of economic activity.

Common decency also requires that a prosperous and growing economy should not tolerate the existence of substandard wages. Increasing the minimum wage would help all areas alike. It would boost the purchasing power of people in low-income areas as well as in prosperous areas.

It would be wrong to assume that raising of the minimum wage would necessarily increase the cost of labor. It is a well-known fact that higher wages mean also more efficient employees and greater productivity per worker. Even in the few cases where the increases in wages would result in somewhat higher costs, I believe that the American public would favor the small sacrifice. I am firmly convinced that every fairminded American consumer is willing to pay the price necessary to assure his fellow American workman at least a decent minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the 18th anniversary of the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, I appeal to you and the Members of the House of Representatives to give serious thought to my proposal. I sincerely hope I can count on your and their support of my bill to raise the minimum hourly wage to \$1.50 during the 85th Congress—God willing.

#### YELLOWTAIL DAM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower vetoed Senate Joint Resolution 135 declaring that the Bureau of Reclamation should pay the Crow Indian tribe \$5 million for the land and powersite for Yellowtail Dam. This is consistent with other administrative actions. The line laid down by his administration has been—and continues to be—that public property is not something to buy, it is only something to be sold at bargain prices to friends of the administration.

When this administration took office, the taxpayers of this country owned 27 synthetic rubber plants. In the years since the end of World War II, these plants had been leased to private rubber companies and had earned an average of \$68 million per year—or about 12 percent interest on the total investment of \$500 million.

This \$500 million public asset, which was earning an income of \$68 million a year, was sold to big business for \$27 million a year for 10 years. This is like buying a house for \$27 a month that you have been renting for \$68 a month—a real bargain for the purchaser.

When this administration took office, the taxpayers of this country owned a barge line in which they had \$22 million invested. The administration sold it for \$9 million plus interest on installments over 10 years.

When this administration took office, our public assets included a \$35 million synthetic fuel plant in Louisiana, Mo. The administration knocked it down to the Hercules Powder Co. for \$5 million.

These examples show that President Eisenhower and his administration officials don't know what property is worth. They don't know because they haven't bought any—all they have done is to conduct bargain sales.

To them—and there are many illustrations besides Hells Canyon—a dam site is not something you buy, it is something you give away to a commercial utility.

When this administration took office, fronted with buying a dam site—something he has not done before—he was unable to recognize a fair and equitable price, which he calls extravagant.

#### POLISH LIBERATION: THE KEY TO FREEDOM

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of note and moment that, according to a very appropriate custom followed for several years by the House, our membership on Polish Independence Day hails that historic event, lauds the gallantry, heroism, and fidelity to freedom of the grievously afflicted Polish people, and in compelling terms gives expression to our hopes and strivings for Polish liberation.

It is also very appropriate, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that at other times during our legislative sessions, we should address ourselves to the present, pitiful plight of millions of freedom-loving, God-fearing Polish people, who continue to be held in bondage by a ruthless and bestial Communist tyranny. Most Americans deplore the existence of this tyranny no less than they deeply resent the ill-advised, unjust, international, diplomatic concessions, which, in effect, gave colorable sanction, and originally made possible, the brutal subjugation of a great nation and its brave, indomitable people,

who for centuries have struggled and sacrificed almost beyond measure to establish and preserve their God-given liberties.

History incontrovertibly proves and conclusively demonstrates the tenacious, undaunted, religious faith of Poland. It eloquently testifies to its unflinching devotion to freedom. It clearly evidences its loyalty to the comradeship of arms, which succeeded after a welter of blood, sweat, toil, and tears in overthrowing the terrorism of the Nazi dictatorship—a struggle in which the Polish nation and its brave people became the first innocent victims of predatory, calloused aggression, suffered the pains of shameful betrayal, and yet clung to the end in bloody sacrifice until final victory came.

I have on many occasions referred to the abandonment and deliverance of Poland over to the Reds as constituting one of the great crimes of the ages, and I think no lover of freedom could validly dispute the fact that it is. I am at the moment more interested, however, in determining how and when this great crime can be expiated, how and when justice can be done, how and when self-determination and free institutions, national sovereignty, and autonomy can be restored to the valiant Poles.

In this battle for liberation of the Poles and other subject peoples suffering at present in the slave states of world communism, there are among others 2 barriers, so to speak, 2 serious obstacles, which stand in the way of ultimate recapture of Polish freedom. The first of these is the spirit of defeatism, which sometimes appears even among the proponents and champions of liberation. This view tends to accept, as it should not, the postulate that Polish domination by Russia and the Communists is an accomplished fact, and that efforts to change the situation would require a great world war and, therefore, are foredoomed to failure.

This specious view, held by many well-meaning friends of Poland and parroted by the pro-Soviet bloc, amplifies a certain sense of indifference blended with a pitying attitude of futility regarding the prospects for changing the status quo by American or international action.

The second barrier is the brazen, defiant policy of the Soviet, which in its foreign relations stresses its dictatorial sovereign power over Poland and enforces that satellite policy at the point of the bayonet and by ruthless liquidation of freedom-minded groups and continued, brutal suppression of the Polish people with one shocking outrage after another.

Both of these views are unfortunate and shortsighted. They fail to recognize the deep, profound vitality of the anti-Communist forces within Poland, in the United States, and the free world which is growing stronger every day.

It is of course morally and ethically wrong not to oppose Soviet control of Poland. From a practical viewpoint, it fails to calculate and give proper weight to the moral indignation of most free peoples, the essential grossness and unjust, inhuman nature of the subjugation process, and the unbending determination of the Polish people and other free

peoples of the world to fight this issue through to the bitter end.

I often think of the great words of an illustrious American patriot and founder—"the same God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." It remains for soulless Communists and others who do not believe in God or in freedom and their atheistic pseudo-intellectual red and pinkish followers in this country to deride and scoff at this noble expression of principles, but true Americans will harken to it and accept it in its philosophy and its practice, because they realize well that liberty is in danger throughout the world, and that unless we are prepared to defend and preserve it, whatever the cost, it will soon disappear into the dark shadows of Communist tyranny.

This administration and this Nation and the American people must never cease to battle for the liberation of Poland and the subject nations until victory is at hand. This world, no less than this Nation, cannot long endure half slave and half free. We will either have freedom for all mankind or we will have oppression and slavery for all with consequent degradation of human values of dignity, decency, independence, and spiritual integrity and then the final collapse of the very last vestige and distinguishing characteristics of civilization.

This Nation must more vigorously project the leadership of this movement for liberation. It is a righteous cause—it is the cause of the Almighty, it is the cause of all free men and women wherever they live. Nothing should deter us from insisting on liberation—neither the braggart threats and blandishments of the Reds, or our own fears of atomic-hydrogen destruction. If we are not free, if our fellow humans are not free, it would be far better for ourselves and for the world to face destruction rather than live and die in serfdom.

But have no concern, my friends. This Nation will not be destroyed. The free world will not be destroyed by any foreign aggression. The only way this Nation can be destroyed is by its own hand—by easy living, by turning away from fundamental values, by seeking easy solutions for problems which can be solved only by the free, earnest, sustained attention and labor of all the people, by profound faith, high courage, and unceasing work.

Let us never fear or appease Russia. If a great war comes—and we must use every means to prevent it—let us be sure, as I believe we can be, that there will be more devastating destruction behind the Iron Curtain than in any other part of the world. I hope that war will never again plague and devastate this sorry globe and we must exert every effort for peace. But we must insist upon preserving our rights and liberties and command respect through overwhelming strength, if necessary, for our Nation and way of life.

There are other ways than force by which this end can be sought. One of the most potent has not yet been used, and that is to withdraw diplomatic recognition from that nation, or those nations, that persist in heaping insult after

insult upon us, while they conspire and work for our destruction and conquest by world communism.

Perhaps this Government should seriously consider this course and this policy. Perhaps this change from appeasement to real firmness is the one thing we need today to bring some light into the international picture and truly convince the Soviet that we cannot be kicked around by any nation. Perhaps that would be the right and the best means of liberating Poland and reestablishing true freedom in the world. People of Poland—keep to your faith, keep your courage high. Never give in to Red tyranny. You will be free sooner than you think.

#### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CHILDREN OF SERVICEMEN WHO DIED IN LINE OF DUTY

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9824) entitled "An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "during", insert "World War I."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "II" and insert "I."

Page 2, after line 10, insert:

"(1) The term 'World War I' means the period beginning on April 6, 1917, and ending on November 11, 1918."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "(1)" and insert "(2)."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)."

Page 2, line 19, after "during", insert "World War I."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "II" and insert "I."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)."

Page 3, line 7, strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "(6)" and insert "(7)."

Page 3, line 18, strike out "(7)" and insert "(8)."

Page 4, line 1, strike out "(8)" and insert "(9)."

Page 4, line 7, strike out "(9)" and insert "(10)."

Page 4, line 13, strike out "(10)" and insert "(11)."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "(11)" and insert "(12)."

Page 4, line 18, strike out "(12)" and insert "(13)."

Page 24, line 2, strike out all after "payments" down to and including "person" in line 8 and insert "of compensation or pension under any law administered by the Vet-

erans' Administration based on the death of a parent to an eligible person over the age of 18 by reason of pursuing a course in an educational institution, or of increased rates, or additional amounts, of compensation or pension under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration because of such a person."

Page 29, after line 21, insert:

#### "APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 513. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration under the headings 'General Operating Expenses' and 'Readjustment Benefits' are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 528 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 528 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. It provides for an open rule and 2 hours of debate on the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to continue and improve cooperative programs the Public Health Service is carrying on with the State and interstate water pollution control agencies under the Water Pollution Control Act, Public Law 845, of the 80th Congress, as amended.

Provision is made for increased technical assistance to States on new and complex problems and to broaden research programs to determine the effects of pollution on public health and



other water uses and to develop more economic methods of treating waste.

The bill also provides that the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board would consist of the Surgeon General, or a sanitary engineering officer designated by him, and nine members appointed by the President, none of whom would be Federal employees.

Section 5 of the bill authorizes the appropriation for each of the next 5 years of \$5 million for grants to States and interstate agencies to cover part of the cost of their water pollution control programs. Allotments to the States would be made by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations on the basis of population, extent of the pollution problem, and the financial need of respective States. However, the Federal share could not exceed a maximum of 66⅔ percent, nor could it be less than 33⅓ percent of the cost. Allotments to interstate agencies would be made on a basis found reasonable and equitable by the Surgeon General.

Section 6 authorizes \$50 million a year for grants to States, municipalities, and interstate agencies for preliminary planning and construction of treatment works. Provision is made that the amount so appropriated is not to exceed \$500 million and grants are limited to 33⅓ percent of the estimated cost of the construction or \$300,000, whichever is smaller. At least 50 percent of the funds are to be used for treatment works for communities of 125,000 or less, and priority is to be given to grants for advance planning.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of the resolution so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9540.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has so ably explained, the purpose of this resolution is to make in order the consideration of H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. The measure is generally satisfactory, and I want to speak of it generally, insofar as it pertains to the extension of the present Water Pollution Control Act. It contains a few minor changes in connection with the present law; but there is one section in this bill which is, I think, a new Government policy and a new type of subsidy that would cost the people of America in my opinion untold millions, hundreds of millions, and finally probably billions of dollars, because it would not be a temporary measure. It has been our experience, I am sure, that whenever you embark upon any subsidy program as an emergency or for a short period of time somehow it becomes permanent before too long, and the amounts involved always become larger rather than smaller.

Section 6 of this bill which I understand was the real bone of controversy within the Public Works Committee, as well as the Rules Committee, provides for the Federal Government to give grants of \$50 million a year for a 10-year period, or \$500 million in all to local communities for the purpose of installing

antipollution facilities, sewage disposal plants, and installations of that kind.

Remember, if you adopt this policy, it would be a return to PWA days of the depression and would of course favor certain communities only. In other words, the communities that have already attempted to support and abide by the Antipollution Act as it is now on the statute books, and have bonded themselves to install these different facilities, would not receive a single penny under this bill. They would have to pay for the local bonds they have issued for purposes of controlling pollution, and then, in turn, pay additional taxes in order to meet the cost of this gigantic new Federal subsidy program.

Let me point out to you, if I may, that in my home town of some 2,500 in southern Ohio, under the compact that has been entered into between the cities in the Ohio Valley to eliminate pollution in the streams of that area, on the request, insistence and demand of the Ohio Health Board, we bonded ourselves for some \$500,000 to put in a sewage disposal plant, with the bonds running until the year 1999, with a cost to each property owner in addition to the taxes to retire the bond issue of some \$3 a month or \$36 a year. The same situation is true in some of the large cities of America. I believe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] will discuss with you the situation in Cincinnati, Ohio. The gentleman from Boston, who has just preceded me, will tell you what has been done there in the way of eliminating pollution and to take care of sewage disposal. Yet those cities and communities would have to pay their own taxes to retire the bonds they have issued and not receive one penny of help in any way from the Federal Government. So this section would create an entirely unfair situation as between communities.

But further than that, as a matter of principle, let me point out to you, if I may, that there is not a single municipality in any single State in this Union of ours that is not in better financial condition and position than the Federal Government.

It is my understanding amendments will be offered by members of the Public Works Committee to eliminate section 6. I hope that the Members will give that section and the debate that will take place upon it their most careful consideration and attention.

Let me again point out that if this bill is passed with section 6 in it we will embark our Government, already in financial difficulty, upon a new program of subsidies to the States and to the local communities that in time will become, in my opinion, an unbearable burden upon the American taxpayers. I shall support the rulemaking consideration of the bill under 2 hours of general debate in order. It is an open rule so that amendments may be offered. If the amendment striking section 6 is adopted, of course, I will support the measure; otherwise, I may not be able to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House on Monday and wish to record the fact at this time that on rollcall No. 65 had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to put on RECORD that I am for this Federal program to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution and Control Act. I believe the Federal Government should be interested in aiding the local communities in their regional sewage disposal programs. We people in western Pennsylvania are curing our own ills, but many of these areas cannot afford such programs as the problem even for western Pennsylvania is more than local.

I urge the House to adopt the rule and likewise support the bill, because it is going forward in an expanded program, a program that will protect the families and the children of future generations, as well as present generations.

The flies and insects living on open sewage on the rivers and streams of this country today find their way onto the tables in homes 5 or 10 miles away in most of the communities along the rivers in a comparatively short time. This is an open invitation to the spread of disease. So, I hope this bill passes to take a good step forward in cleaning up our rivers and streams, and to wipe out pollution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the bill which is the subject of this resolution is an excellent one generally, and it is certainly needed. The control and strengthening of the Water Pollution Control Act that now exists is vitally necessary, of course, to this country.

My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, has referred to section 6 of the bill. There are some of us on the committee who vigorously opposed the adoption of section 6 in this bill, which provides, as he said, for a completely new Federal activity and a completely new Federal spending program. In these days when all of us are talking about limiting and reducing the activities of the Federal Government, when we are talking about balancing the budget, we should carefully examine section 6 in this bill, which provides for another huge spending program on the part of the Federal Government. For the first time we are going to bypass the States, if this section becomes law, and contribute Federal funds directly to municipalities. It will be the Surgeon General who will determine which municipalities shall be given Federal aid, how much, and what priority should be given to certain cities.

Let me point out, first, that section 6 was not in the Senate bill. Section 6 is not recommended; in fact, it is opposed by the administration. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare vigorously opposed this section in the hearings before the committee. Usually the Congress has to put some check on the agencies of the Government because of their requests for more money, for re-

quests that the Federal Government engage in new activities. Here we have a case where the Congress is attempting to foist upon the agency an activity and a program which it vigorously opposes.

The proponents of this bill argue that the small cities will not be able to comply with the enforcement provisions of this bill. That they will not be able to furnish adequate sewage disposal plants because they are not in a position to finance these projects. As my colleague from Ohio pointed out, the debt of the Federal Government exceeds the debt of all of the cities and all of the States and all of the other nations of the world combined. Therefore, who is best able to pay—the cities or the Federal Government?

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made a survey and in its testimony clearly indicated that the cities who are asking for this new Federal-aid program failed conclusively to demonstrate the need for Federal aid. They pointed out that the only reason certain cities are not able to comply with the orders to stop pollution in their areas is because they have not given priority to pollution problems. They have been more interested in providing streets, even playgrounds and swimming pools than cleaning up the sewage that comes from the residences and the businesses in the area.

This bill, of course, provides only for the expenditure of \$500 million. The original bill provided for an expenditure of \$1 billion. But let us not be misled to believe that this is a program that is going to cost only \$500 million, because that is just not so. We are getting our foot in the door. This is a new spending spree by the Federal Government. I shall show you that \$500 million is only a drop in the bucket compared to the eventual cost of this program.

My own city of Cincinnati just completed a vast disposal plant installation at a cost of \$50 million. That is \$50 million for 1 city, while this program provides only \$50 million of Federal aid for all of the cities of the United States in 1 year, over a period of 10 years. So what you are going to have is a program that will cost not \$500 million, but a program that, before we get through, is going to cost about \$7 billion. As soon as you give aid to some of these cities then the other cities are bound to come in and ask for aid. They will be entitled to it, and the Congress will not hesitate in future years to appropriate the necessary money.

What about the cities who have pioneered in water-pollution control—cities like Cincinnati and the city of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and hundreds of others in this country, who have taxed the people of their communities, to eliminate pollution? As I said, the city of Cincinnati, which does not have a great deal of money has had to raise the money for its disposal plant. In fact, the city of Cincinnati had to impose an income tax in the last year in order to operate that city. When we provided for this disposal system which, as I said, cost \$50 million, we provided the money to pay for it by placing an 8-cent tax on every 100 cubic feet of water. The

cost for the plant is paid by those who use the sewers. Industry in the area that contributes excessive pollution is required to pay a surcharge.

The argument that small cities cannot do this job is fallacious. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare survey showed that it is fallacious. I know of some small cities upstream from Cincinnati. They do not have an income tax; they have not provided a sewage or water tax to take care of their pollution. In addition to that, the assessed value of real estate is about 25 percent of the actual market value, whereas the valuation in the city of Cincinnati is from 75 to 90 percent of the market value.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Is it not a fact that it was developed that if we provide for these grants-in-aid, it will not prove of help to facilitate and expedite the building of sewage-control systems, but will only tend to delay them, because everybody will be waiting from here on out, for this aid?

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman from New York is absolutely correct because, as I said, we provide only \$500 million in this bill. The cities that do not come in the first time, instead of going forward with sewage-disposal plants as has been done in other communities, will wait until the Congress appropriates more money.

Mr. BECKER. The best thing we can do is to provide no money at all in this bill so that the cities and the towns will proceed with the erection of the facilities that they need, as they should.

Mr. SCHERER. That has been the almost uncontradicted testimony before the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman continues to speak of those cities which have been able to solve their fiscal problems through the imposition of a city income tax. The gentleman also says that most of them have not seen fit to levy a local income tax. Is not the gentleman aware that in most of the States cities are not permitted by State law to levy city income taxes; that in most States State laws restrict cities as to the taxes they may levy, and that they are bonded to the hilt?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to that question. There are two methods which can be followed by these cities. They can increase the assessed valuation of the real estate duplicate to furnish the necessary money to do this job; they can go at least to 50 percent of the market value of the real estate. Secondly, they can levy a sewer or water tax, as the city of Cincinnati has done in order to build its plant; and thirdly, the States can amend their State law instead of coming to the Federal Government, which is least able of all the segments of government to support a program such as this.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Is it not true that the National Municipal Association has been pushing very hard for this bill and that their statement before our committee was that the municipalities could not borrow money in sufficient quantity to carry out this program?

Mr. SCHERER. You would expect that professional group to do that. But I certainly do not agree with its testimony, and neither does the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I do not think anyone has refuted their testimony before our committee. And one other thing that directly points up the matter so far as the Federal Government is concerned, each year for the last 8 years we have been progressively dropping, dropping, dropping down in the matter of stopping stream pollution.

Mr. SCHERER. The new enforcement provisions of this bill are going to take care of that.

The gentleman represents the great State of West Virginia. There are a number of cities in West Virginia along the Ohio River. If Cincinnati has to contribute to this program, when we have taken care of our own pollution then we are going to have to pay twice in order to take care of the cities of West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. You do not want the pollution from West Virginia coming down on Cincinnati. If we feel we cannot pay for it, you will continue to get the pollution from West Virginia.

Mr. SCHERER. What is the percentage of assessed valuation of the real estate of the West Virginia cities along the Ohio River?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I do not have those figures.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I wish to compliment the city of Cincinnati on the work it has been doing, just as Pittsburgh has, in cleaning up this sewage disposal matter. In eastern Ohio around the Youngstown area, I do not appreciate the people that are trying to come in here and get Federal funds on the basis of flood control to do what they ought to be doing on their own, taking care of the sewage disposal. They try to get it under another program unless you come right out and say the Federal Government is going to set up a program to help on sewage disposal. I would rather face it directly, even though Pittsburgh is well advanced on the program and has gotten ahead of the others. As the gentleman from West Virginia says, we fellows that are ahead of the game do not want other cities and villages tossing in the sewage and undoing our work.

Mr. SCHERER. Do not get me wrong. There are provisions in this bill for Federal assistance, technical assistance, for planning, research, and study. I agree with that section of the bill that provides for those things. But I want to



ask, how many cities that say they cannot support such a program as will be required under the enforcement provisions, I repeat, how many of them could not do it if they gave priority to sewage disposal rather than to parks, playgrounds, streets, and even recreational facilities?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Under the highway program we heard references to a pay-back for roads that States had already built which are going to be part of the national program. Is there any such provision in this bill to reimburse those cities which have recently built such facilities?

Mr. SCHERER. There are no provisions for reimbursement in this bill.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. As a member of the committee, may I ask if it is not a fact that this is the only controversial section of the entire bill?

Mr. SCHERER. I want to make it clear that those of us who oppose this section are not opposing this bill.

Mr. BECKER. As a matter of fact, they are in favor of it.

Mr. SCHERER. The chairman of this committee has done an excellent job. We need this bill badly.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I quote from the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy of December 22, 1955:

An orderly use and control of water resources requires a background of physical facts, understanding, and accumulated experience. For any problem involving water use and development, it is necessary to know when and how much water is available in a given area and how it is distributed. This involves the study of amounts and distribution of rainfall, the flow of rivers, the occurrence of water in the ground, the nature of the rocks and the soil, and other characteristics of both land and water.

This Committee has delegated responsibility for municipal and industrial water supply planning and pollution control to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of which Department the Public Health Service is a constituent agency. This delegation carries with it the responsibility for basic data collection in the water-resources development and conservation areas.

H. R. 9540 or S. 890, as reported by the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, directs the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to collect and disseminate basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality and such other information related to water-pollution prevention and control as he deems necessary.

Thus the Public Health Service would be able to assume its proper responsibility and to share with other Federal agen-

cies the total Federal responsibility of the overall basic data program.

Need exists for a national water quality basic data program relating to sewage and industrial waste pollution. Need also exists for a complete and current national inventory of water, sewage, and industrial waste facilities. Moreover, a detailed basic data program should be related to the economics of water supplies and pollution control.

More specifically, the country needs base lines for measuring progress in water quality improvement and for the purpose of anticipating deterioration of the Nation's waters. The damages to water uses should be identified as to nature, cause and extent. Where water supplies require a high degree of purity, information is vitally needed as to a selection of sources for domestic and industrial water supplies. It is also important to be selective in the matter of developing sources where a lesser degree of purity is needed. In areas where conservation or improvement of water quality is of major importance, intelligent planning cannot be accomplished without essential information on basic water data.

Other specific basic data needs for which the proposed legislation is designed to serve are: (a) inventory of present and future desired water uses of various streams, (b) the determination of trends in domestic and municipal water supply and sewage and industrial waste practices, (c) implementation of mobilization readiness planning for water supply, (d) provision of data for certification of interstate common carrier watering points, (e) provision of guides in industrial site selection, and (f) provision of guides to research needs relating to water, sewage, and industrial waste facilities.

I am informed that the basic data program contemplated under the proposed legislation will be planned to supplement and not to duplicate other basic data programs of other agencies. Whenever possible, cooperation will be carried on with the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies to permit the maximum facility and economy.

This aspect of the measure now under consideration by the House is one that Members of this body can hardly reject. The cost of such a program is minimal compared with the need of protecting future investments of all agencies of government and of private industry in the conservation of the Nation's water.

#### PLANNING FOCUS

The development of additional water supplies to support expected population and industrial growth will present problems in areas where convenient and economical sources have already been fully developed. Consequently greater conservation of available water resources through pollution control is becoming more and more important in many areas.

It is also important that the Federal Government cooperate with the States in order to keep our streams reasonably clean, and thus anticipate the problem which confronts urban areas.

In a recent survey the Public Health Service found that more than 52 million

people in communities of 25,000 and over now depend upon surface sources for their daily water supplies, as compared with fewer than 40 million—12 million increase—8 years ago. It should also be noted that dependence on untreated water cannot be relied on. Less than 1 percent of the population in communities of 25,000 and over today find it possible to use untreated water.

In the last 8 years the number of communities of 25,000 and over has increased from 422 to 570 and their combined population from 53 million to 64 million. Considering outlying suburbs to these communities, the population increase has been from 62 million to 83 million.

These population figures are impressive in relation to the water supply needs in a situation where the overall water resource is practically constant. The water supply problem is emphasized by the results of a nationwide inventory made by the Public Health Service of 1,532 community water facilities. One out of four of the larger urban areas have reported they will need additional water supplies to meet municipal and industrial growth. More than half the water supply facilities covered by the survey were reported as needing improvement or enlargement and some involved the development of new supplies.

In recent years, many cities have experienced water shortages during periods of low rainfall. Such situations are likely to increase in both number and severity as population and industry continue to expand. This obviously calls for extensive advance planning for water. In many instances, sizable water development projects will be needed. Adequate treatment of the ever-mounting quantity of wastes will permit more extensive use of available surface water. This is the logical answer to some of the present supply problems. For treatment of sewage and wastes to protect water quality makes possible the reuse of water as streams flow from city to city and from State to State.

The Federal Government is in an excellent position to cooperate with the States in planning for the control of pollution in river basins in which several States are involved. Such control must be approached in a practical manner. A balance must be struck which maintains quality of stream waters for desirable uses, and at the same time permits reasonable use of the streams for disposing of treated sewage and industrial waste. Planning of this nature is absolutely necessary for us to meet our future water supply needs. Such planning is urgent. According to the report of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power, planning is not being carried out at present with necessary foresight.

An extension of the Water Pollution Control Act will permit more vigor and foresight to be put into planning for water pollution control. Therefore, I propose to vote for the enactment of the water pollution control measure now before the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, being from a State and representing a district where our water resources, while certainly ranking among our greatest assets, present, too, some of our major problems, I am keenly conscious of the necessity for expanding and strengthening the Nation's Water Pollution Control Act, while in the process of extending it.

This holds especially true for areas, such as my own, where the availability of adequate, even abundant, water resources is resulting in increased industrialization. This industrial development is making it essential to provide for stronger and more comprehensive measures for the conservation of water resources and for effective means for pollution abatement and control.

It shall not be my purpose to enter into detailed discussion of provisions of the bill now before the House. My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and others of his Public Works Subcommittee have clearly and effectively summarized and explained the legislation. It is my purpose, however, to declare my support for the bill as reported by the committee.

The need for Federal assistance to the States and political subdivisions, through financial grants-in-aid, for construction of sewage treatment and disposal plants is self-evident. Local interests have been, on the whole, unable to keep pace in providing such facilities, and, consequently, the unfilled need for pollution-control works has reached serious proportions.

With respect to this bill's provisions which would provide funds to train personnel in water control work, to conduct research and administer State programs, I am of the opinion that there can be but little, if any, valid opposition. And I fully concur in the bill's provisions which would give the Surgeon General stronger enforcement powers in instances where State agencies may be lax or slow in combating pollution. I believe that this power, which does not infringe upon the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, will result in more prompt and effective remedial action in many cases, with the result being a substantial contribution to the public health and welfare.

It is my hope that enactment of this Federal legislation may have among its beneficial effects the adoption by the various States of measures to broaden and strengthen their own laws relating to the problems of water conservation and pollution abatement and control. I especially hope that the States may be encouraged to enact legislation requiring industrial users of water to return the water, purified after use, to the same artesian strata from which it was taken. Many current water-use practices are resulting in serious depletion of the artesian sources.

May I conclude by reaffirming my support of the Blatnik bill, with its provisions for the development and operation of comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries, and for improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters; and

which also gives due regard to improvements which are necessary to conserve waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agriculture, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this section 6 of the bill is going to be quite controversial and I wish to discuss it for a few minutes. I might say about the history of this legislation that this bill is intended to be an extension of existing law. The present water-pollution bill would expire on the 30th of June. A bill was brought out some months ago, but there was so much controversy about it that the committee took it back and took out most of the features to which the various States were objecting. Somewhere along the line this section 6 appeared in the bill and that is what I want to talk about. The bill authorizes one-half billion dollars at the rate of \$50 million a year to be distributed among cities that have not cleaned up their pollutions. Under the formula, a city that has done its duty and has cleaned up and gone to all the expense and done the work or provided for doing the work does not get a nickel out of the bill. On the contrary, the city that has not attended to its business and has not undertaken to clean up its pollution not only gets paid for its negligence and its indifference, but the cities that have helped and have done the work are penalized in that they have to pay their proportion of the Federal taxes that go into this project. That seems to me totally inequitable. I hope the House will see fit to strike that out. The bill can be completely adequate so far as the original intent is concerned without that section in it, and as has been said here it embarks the Federal Government on another tremendous spending program. Certainly, such an inequitable provision ought not to be carried into this bill.

I want to call attention particularly, however, to one section of this bill that has to do with the distribution of funds. I would hate to vote for this section, but I will vote for it if anybody in this House can tell me what it means. I want to read it to you. You will find it on page 10 of the bill.

On line 18, it says:

(h) (1) The "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 percent less than percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ percent or less than 33⅓ percent, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ percent.

I always thought, of course, that we have changed a lot of rules around here since I have been in the Congress. But we do still have some old rules which, I think, still stick. I thought 100 percent less than any figure was nothing.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may try to explain that?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman. I have been trying to get that straightened out. I asked the gentleman about it in the Committee on Rules the other day.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman is quite right that at first sight it sounds like gobbledygook but the purpose and the meaning of it is very simple.

The program grant provisions of H. R. 9540—section 5—has two essential elements. The first provides for an allocation among the States of the Federal grant funds and the second provides for State matching of these allotments.

Most Federal grant programs contain these two elements. The following two programs administered by this Department are very similar in allotment and matching procedures to the proposals in H. R. 9540:

Hospital and medical facilities survey and construction—Hill-Burton.

Vocational rehabilitation.

But, the important thing is this: All that section does is to establish a formula by which these funds shall be distributed. Primarily, it is on the basis of the economic situation or the ability of these localities to pay for their own program plus population. What it means is this: If, in a given State, the per capita income is the same as the national income, that is 1 to 1—or 100 percent to 100 percent, then, the same ratio to 50 percent would be 50 to 50. That means the Federal funds are 50 and the State funds are 50. If, in the high income State that is economically well off, the per capita income is 120 to 100 as a national average, then one-half of 120 percent is 60 percent and you deduct that from 100 and that is 100 percent less 60 percent. That means the Federal share is only 40 percent and the State's share is 60 percent because their economic situation is favorable.

In an economic area where the per capita income is less, let us say it is 80 percent of the national per capita income, then half of 80 percent is 40 percent and you subtract that again from 100 percent, in other words, 100 percent less 40 percent and then the Federal share becomes 60 percent, to 40 percent for the States. It sounds complicated. The purpose is simple. It gives a little flexibility, so that in economically favorable areas they carry up to two-thirds of the cost, and the Federal Government one-third. In lower income areas the Federal Government will carry up to two-thirds and the State only one-third.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I hope that you smart boys know the answer if it is as simple as my friend says it is—and I want to say parenthetically that the gentleman has done a tremendous amount of work on this bill. It is an important bill and it ought to be adopted, but certainly there is no reason why it should not be plain. I want to help the gentleman get through his bill, but I want to get through a bill that somebody can understand. But I received a lot of my education in a little one-room red schoolhouse, and I was always told that "100 percent less" than something was nothing. If it is less 100



percent, I do not see how it can be anything, and I do not see why you could not have put in simple language to say that. I want to get something that we can understand. If somebody comes to me and asks me what it means, I would like to be able to tell them. I have been asking around, but I cannot find what it means. It seems to me there should be some simple language that we could put in there.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield, and I want to compliment the gentleman on the tremendous amount of work he has done.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. We did raise that same point in committee, about having more simple language. This language was written by the Department of Health.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sure it was.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is the same language that is in other legislation, such as the Hill-Burton Act. It is simple to work out. When a community is more than the average, it pays more, and when it is less it pays less. It is within a range from one-third to two-thirds.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will tell you what I think it was. It was written by the Department of Health and Education, and I think it means if you pass this bill in its present form then the Department of Education will decide whatever they want to decide, and it can be done under this language. It cannot mean anything.

I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE.]

Mr. BURNSIDE. We have a committee amendment that will clear this somewhat.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is fine.

Mr. BURNSIDE. One other thing. The Senate passed this after thinking over it for a long time. It has been on the statute books for some time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now, after we get this clarified, I just wonder how under this section 6 it is going to work and who is going to get what. It says that certain gentlemen shall distribute it and in such manner that will tend to result in a wide distribution of such funds amongst the several areas of the United States. Does that mean that the fellow who has the most creaky wheel, the wheel that creaks the loudest, is going to get the most grease? I am ashamed sometimes when people ask me about a law—"What does it mean?" I do not see why you cannot put these things into language that we know what it means and we do not have to ask the Department of Education what it means.

I join with the gentleman from Michigan in the hope that the House will strike out section 6 and not start on this tremendous campaign that was not contemplated in the original legislation. Why, in this terrible state of fiscal affairs of this Nation, should we do this thing which is going to make cities that have done their job pay for the cities that have not attended to business?

I hope the House will give that serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9540, with Mr. YATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9540 is an act to extend and revise the existing Water Pollution Control Act which was passed in 1948 after half a century of discussion and consideration of the water-pollution problem and the responsibility of the Federal Government in this field of water resources use. In 1948 the first comprehensive legislation of this kind was passed, which is the existing law, Public Law 845. I use the term "comprehensive" but I wish to call the attention of the membership of the House to the fact that at that time in the House Public Works Committee it was felt that that was merely an initial step in which some Federal responsibility was justifiable to stimulate, encourage, and to some degree assist, in a cooperative way, State and local action for abatement of water pollution, which, even at that time, 8 years ago, was recognized as of growing seriousness. The act, Public Law 845, has now been on the statute books for 8 years and it is time that we reassess the effectiveness of that act.

#### THE GOVERNMENT ROLE IN POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The increased concern of municipalities, States, industries, and the public generally over shortages of fresh water of acceptable quality—as evidenced by the attention that is being given to the problem by the press and other media and by the number of commissions that have studied the matter in recent years—directed attention to the proper role of the Government in relation to development and use of the Nation's water resources. The bill now under consideration further defines the functions of the Federal Government in cooperating with the States to meet the grave national water pollution-control problem. It has been developed after hearing the views of all interested parties.

Last year the other body passed a water pollution control bill, S. 890, extending, revising, and improving the ex-

isting act. When the bill came over to the House side, after rather brief hearings the House committee favorably reported the bill to the House floor. At that time we received many negative queries and objections from Congressmen all over the country, particularly in those areas where the industry people, especially the pulp and paper industries, raised objections about insufficient hearings. There was also serious controversy on the enforcement procedure in the existing law and in the proposed Senate act. In view of that we recalled the bill from the floor, went back into committee, and held extensive hearings. We heard over 78 witnesses in weeks-long hearings on the entire water pollution problem.

We asked the State health officers and State health agencies to get together and work out an enforcement procedure which would get the broadest possible support among the States. That was done in a most effective and laudable manner.

The State water pollution control administrators and health officials under the able leadership of Dr. Daniel Bergsma, commissioner of health of New Jersey and president of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, and Mr. Milton P. Adams, executive secretary of the Water Resources Commission, after consultation with representatives of conservation and industry and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, developed a number of amendments to meet objections raised by some of the States. These provisions were incorporated into H. R. 9540 which I introduced on February 27.

Because it was evident that the crux of the national pollution problem is the lag in construction of waste treatment works, I added section 6, which provides for direct Federal grants to assist municipalities in the construction of sewage disposal facilities. My original proposal called for \$100 million of Federal grants each year for 10 years, or a total of \$1 billion. This turned out to be the controversial section of the bill with the minority membership in strong opposition, and the majority in equal support. The Department of Health opposed it, although agreeing that we are seriously behind with our plants and facilities for coping with pollution abatement. So, to compromise, the majority membership of the committee went along with the minority in cutting the total amount in half, from \$100 million a year to \$50 million a year, for a total of 10 years.

#### MAIN PROVISIONS OF H. R. 9540

The legislation under consideration would continue the present Federal-State cooperative program which is based on the established principle of recognizing the primary rights and responsibilities of the States in controlling water pollution. The bill would correct the insufficiencies of present law in several specific ways:

First, it authorizes an intensified and broadened research program designed to tap the research potentials of universities, research centers, and other institutions throughout the country on all aspects of the water pollution problem.

Second. It provides for program grants to States to help them strengthen all aspects of their water pollution control activities. The present law contains a provision for grants to States, but it confines the grants to studies related to industrial pollution.

Third. It improves the enforcement provision of the present law relating to the abatement of interstate pollution—pollution originating in one State which endangers the health and welfare of persons in another State. It eliminates the provision of present law requiring the consent of the State in which the pollution originates before court action may be instituted. Court action under the proposed legislation could be brought either with the consent of the State in which the pollution originates or at the request of the State injured by the pollution. The improved enforcement procedures of the bill constitute a reasonable balance between the primary rights of the States to control water pollution within their boundaries and the rights of the States affected by pollution from another State to have available to them a practical remedy.

Fourth. The bill continues the principle in present law authorizing Federal financial aid for construction of treatment works. Instead of the construction loan provisions in the existing act, however, matching grants of \$50 million a year to States, municipalities, intermunicipalities, and interstate agencies for the preliminary planning and construction of treatment works would be authorized. The aggregate of sums so appropriated would not exceed \$500 million. Grants are limited to 33 1/3 percent of the estimated reasonable cost of the construction or \$300,000 whichever is the smaller. At least 50 percent of the funds so authorized are to be used for treatment works servicing communities of 125,000 population or under, and priority is to be given to grants for advance planning.

#### NEED FOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Testimony and evidence presented during the hearings on this bill clearly demonstrated the need for Federal financial assistance for the construction of sewage-treatment works. This is borne out by the record. The only time the construction of sewage-treatment works kept pace with the need for such construction was during the period 1933 to 1939 when Federal funds were made available through such programs as the Public Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration. Before that, and since, construction has lagged until today there is a huge backlog of needed treatment works.

Construction to take care of this backlog and at the same time keep pace with the ever-growing demands on cities and towns due to increased population and industrialization requires great capital outlay. Representatives of these cities and towns testified as to the need for financial assistance. Many communities are earnestly trying to solve these problems but have reached the limit of their legal bonded indebtedness. The tax resources of others are limited by State law and constitution. Many are simply

financially unable to raise sufficient revenue to construct needed treatment works. In the meantime these communities continue to pollute the streams, jeopardizing the health of their neighbors, and degrading the Nation's most vital resource.

A small amount of Federal financial aid for construction as provided in this bill will serve to stimulate local programs of treatment works construction by providing an incentive to take action now to clean up and protect the waters of this Nation.

Before you can evaluate correctly as to whether a water pollution control program is too strong, whether, as some say, it has too many teeth in it, or, on the contrary, whether it is too weak, too inadequate and does not have enough teeth, we feel you should have as a background a broad, overall picture, a panoramic mental picture, of the water problem of America. Then you superimpose on that the mechanism, the machinery, with which you attempt to abate pollution. Thereby you can determine the relative merits or effectiveness of a pollution-control program.

So, briefly, to present the national picture of the water problem which we are here discussing, here is a chart which will aid you in a verbal description, covering the last 50 years of America's history. In 1900, the population was 75 million people, and industry was rather primitive as compared to today. From 1900 to 1950 what happened? In those 50 years, in a half century of America's progress, the population doubled, industry increased 7 times. Mind you, this is in terms of the fact that the water supply is constant. There is not any more water nor any less water than there was 50 years ago. It is in the use and reuse of the water that enables twice as many people to use water and more water per capita. People did not have so many showers and baths in 1900. People used more water per capita in 1950.

What is now happening? Let us project ahead only for 20 years. It is estimated that the population will go from 150 million to over 200 million, an increase of over 25 percent. More important is the industrial development. Industry will increase twice what we had in 1950, 14 times what we had in 1900, 75 years back. In the last 50 years the technological progress in America has been greater than in the last 2,000 years of the entire world. So that is the competitive situation that we now find ourselves faced with in regard to our fixed water supply. We have this situation, more and more water is going to be used and as more water is used more water is polluted, giving us less available usable water in the first place. It is a vicious circle. You have more and more industries using more water. The more used the more it is polluted, leaving us less water to begin with. Around and around she goes and where it will stop no one knows. Except we have the handwriting on the wall.

#### WATER POLLUTION AND THE NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES PROBLEM

Water use for all purposes is on the increase, particularly for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and recreational

purposes, and for transportation of wastes. It is estimated that by 1975 the Nation's population will be in the range of 200 million persons and industrial capacity will be double the 1950 levels. Public water supply use will probably increase from 17 billion gallons per day to 30 billion gallons per day, and industrial water use, excluding power, will increase from 60 billion gallons per day to 115 billion gallons per day.

By 1975, reliable estimates indicate this country will require an increase in the current water supply of 145 percent—equal to the additional supply of 120 New York Citys, requiring the flow of about 11 Colorado Rivers or equal to the continuous flow over Niagara Falls. Further, as our economy expands, leisure time increases, and population grows, it will become necessary to provide more and more waters suitable for recreation, fish and wildlife, and other legitimate uses.

In meeting these increasing demands, the control of pollution has an essential role in the Nation's water-resources problem. Pollution is a waste of water. The greater the degree of pollution, the greater is the waste. Pollution can be just as effective in reducing a water resource for use as drought. Pollution control, therefore, is now recognized as a key to the national problem of water conservation. Pollution control will permit repeated reuse of the same water as it flows from its source to the sea.

In recent years, population and industry have spread to all parts of the country with the result that now almost all of the Nation's waters are affected by sewage and industrial wastes. As our population grows and our economy expands, pollution of the Nation's waters will continue to increase unless control measures are materially accelerated.

In 1920, the population equivalent of municipal wastes reaching our stream was about 40 million persons. This means the organic loading contained in the sewage, treated and untreated, discharged to streams amounted to the equivalent of the organic content in the raw or untreated sewage from 40 million persons. In 1955 the equivalent of raw sewage from nearly 55 million persons was being discharged to the Nation's waters.

The increase with respect to industrial wastes has been even greater. Reliable estimates indicate that in 1920 organic industrial waste accounted for a pollution load equal to the raw sewage from about 50 million persons and in 1955 accounted for an organic pollution load equivalent to the raw sewage from 110 million persons. Since 1920 the organic pollution load brought to bear on our water resources has increased by a population equivalent of approximately 75 million persons, despite the progress that was made in municipal sewage treatment plant construction under the Public Works Administration during the 1930's, and that which has been made by industry in recent years. In addition, ever-increasing quantities of inorganic wastes such as acids, toxic metals, cyanides, and radioactive materials are being discharged to our Nation's waterways.



A great deal needs to be done to control municipal and industrial pollution. It is estimated that projects to meet the present backlog of needs for sewage-treatment plants and intercepting sewers would cost in excess of \$1.9 billion. During the period 1955-65 the cost of replacing sewage-treatment facilities reaching obsolescence is estimated to total \$1.72 billion. Sewage-treatment requirements of an increasing population during the 1955-65 period are estimated to cost an additional \$1.71 billion. This is a total cost for municipal pollution-abatement needs during 1955-65 of about \$5 billion.

The estimated costs for new sewer systems and extensions to existing systems during 1955-65 total approximately \$5.5 billion. Sewer needs reported as of today will cost an estimated \$2.35 billion; replacement needs caused by obsolescence during the next 10 years will cost \$1.09 billion; and during this same period new sewer requirements will cost approximately \$2.06 billion. The present needs for industrial waste treatment and disposal projects to meet 1955 requirements will cost an estimated \$2.5 billion.

A review of recently proposed State and Federal legislation and the findings of various commissions and committees studying water pollution and water resources development problems shows a growing consideration of the need for financial assistance to State and local governments. To illustrate, the final report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—Kestnbaum Committee—recommends that study be given to the desirability of Federal assistance to cooperative programs for the construction of pollution-abatement facilities.

Once the Nation has caught up on the tremendous backlog of needed construction—assuming greater progress in research and the further development of State and interstate pollution control programs—the offensive against water pollution will be well underway. Today we are on the defensive on all fronts, especially in the brick and mortar job of building sewage treatment works.

During the hearings on H. R. 9540, Assistant Secretary Roswell B. Perkins of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conceded that pollution of the Nation's water resources had become steadily worse during the last 5 years. In a subsequent speech, Mr. Perkins made this statement regarding the need for more pollution abatement works:

I personally view the need for waste treatment works as ranking second only to schools in priority of claim on our capital outlay dollars for public works.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the conservation of our water resources and the maintenance of its purity is one of the great problems of the day and will become more serious as the years go by. I am in favor of this legislation, and want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for sponsoring this bill, and the committee for reporting it favorably.

Moreover, it is a national problem and the United States Government should help the cities and States solve their problems of sewage disposal and water protection and conservation. Many of the local communities just do not have the income necessary to do the job themselves.

The appropriation necessary to finance this legislation is just a drop in the bucket compared with the money we are spending in foreign countries on similar projects. Some of these may be necessary, but at the same time we must take care of this problem at home. I will vote for the bill, and against this amendment that would eliminate section 6. The adoption of the Dondero amendment would make the bill largely ineffective.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank my good friend.

So that is the picture. Now, in 1948, when the Federal Government stepped into the picture for the first time, we had grants-in-aid for State pollution-control programs. But in the entire 8 years of the law, only for 3 years were these grants given to States to help build up their State pollution-control agencies. We found out that even as late as last year, 1954, and 1955, that of the 48 States 32 of them spent \$50,000 a year or less for their whole State pollution-control programs. Twenty-three of them spent only \$30,000 a year or less. Many States only spent \$5,000 or \$7,000 for a whole year for the entire pollution-control programs in their respective States. Why, in many of those cases that amount of money would not be sufficient to provide 1 cesspool for part of a suburb of 1 municipality. Then, when the Federal Government came along with \$1 million for State program grants, look what happened [pointing to chart]. In 1950, 1951, and 1952, from \$2 million total money spent by all of the States, it rose steadily in 3 years up to \$4 million. In that year the Federal grants were cut off. What happened to the State programs? They froze. Their expenditures have been at a plateau for the last 4 years and will continue at that plateau.

So the point I wish to stress in the grants money as well as in the aid for sewage disposal facilities for municipalities, the Federal Government does not do anything like the major part of the job for either the States or the municipalities, but it merely provides an incentive plus a little assistance, and once the States start, they carry on on their own, because we want the primary responsibility to rest in the States and local government units in this water-pollution-control program.

A great deal was said during the discussion on the rule in opposition to grants-in-aid to municipalities for the construction of sewage disposal facilities. We went into this as carefully as was possible, consulting with the health authorities, with the health departments of the States, with industry, with conservation groups, with mayors, with the American Municipal Association; went back into the records; into the matter of six major studies made by the Congress itself on national water pollution policy, and in each one of them attention was

called that the Federal Government should take a careful look into this field of giving Federal aid for the construction of sewage disposal facilities.

Here we have a chart showing the total amount of money spent by municipalities for sewage disposal facilities since 1915 up to 1950, a period of 35 years. The average for that entire period is \$172 million. And, as you look over that period there is only one time in the 50 years of history we are talking about that construction of facilities was adequate enough to meet the pollution abatement problem, and that was in the WPA and the PWA days of 1933 to 1939 in which 60 percent of the money came from the Federal Government. That is the only time; never before and never since.

What has happened? There was an average of \$172 million a year being spent for sewage disposal facilities. Then came the war. It dropped to \$58 million a year. We were falling further and further behind and rapidly since 1940. The population increased rapidly. More homes were being built. More young people were getting married. There were more children. We had the highest birth rate in the history of America. We had one of the most phenomenal growths in industry at a time when we were doing so little in the matter of pollution abatement.

The complex organic chemicals that are finding their way into the streams and rivers of the country today are the result, of course, of the phenomenal development of new manufacturing processes all up and down the country.

Such industries as the synthetic fabrics, the plastics, and the detergents have become gigantic operations in the span of just a few years. The production of detergents, for example, has grown from almost nothing in 1940 to almost 2 billion pounds in 1955. It is expected to double by 1975.

The processes for waste treatment, on the other hand, differ very little from those that were developed in the early part of the century. Research in the field of waste treatment simply has not kept up with the increasing quantity and complexity of the wastes produced as a result of this phenomenal development of these modern industries.

Do you know what detergents do to the water? Somebody was talking about the facilities around Pittsburgh. I intend to cast no reflections on that city. But here in this container is water from Pittsburgh that was recaptured out of the Ohio River at Wheeling, W. Va., almost 100 miles downstream. When I shake it up, see what happens. It foams up like soapsuds in your sink. Look at that detergent, look at that foam. Yet we do not know how to get rid of that. The people in Wheeling, W. Va., and all the other communities downstream have to suck this in through their intake pipes and treat it by some expensive process to make it potable, so that they may drink it with safety.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman points out that the cities and the States of this country have spent very little in an effort to control water pollution. In that the gentleman is correct. May I ask the gentleman this question, however? Will not the new enforcement provision in this bill, which is a good one, compel the cities and States to spend the money that is needed?

Mr. BLATNIK. You cannot squeeze blood out of a turnip. Many of these municipalities have reached the limit of their bonded indebtedness. They do not have other financial resources. You cannot go to them and talk about a threat of prosecution by the Attorney General of the United States unless they go ahead and build sewage disposal plants. How can they comply? They are caught in a squeeze. We who are charged with the duty of enforcing that good enforcement provision which the gentleman refers to must have some little responsibility concerning that, to give them a little bit of help, in order that they may help themselves to comply with that enforcement provision.

Mr. Chairman, if I may review just once again, for the entire 50 years, the national average has been \$172 million a year for municipal construction. The only time in all of our history when the amount was adequate was in the period 1933 to 1939, about 20 years ago. But in the last 8 years, what has happened? The existing law provides \$22½ million in loans at 2 percent interest. It authorizes an advance of \$1 million for planning. What has happened? In 8 years there has been not one single project approved. Why? Because municipalities just cannot borrow money. They cannot go out and seek loans because of the limitation on their bonded indebtedness, or some other constitutional limitation, whatever it may be.

That is the record. Only one time in our history was the amount that was used adequate and that was when we had direct grants, in the period from 1933 to 1939. In the last 8 years, the only time we have had any Federal law, the only time we tried to give any Federal assistance was in the form of loans, and there has been not one single project. As a matter of fact, this average of \$172 million a year should go up to \$450 million a year, for a total of \$5 billion in the next 10 or 12 years, and the only way to do that, to clean up this mess that we have got in America today is under the program we are proposing in H. R. 9540. We are spending less than half of what is required.

Somebody has said, "But these municipalities do not want to do anything about it." The record will show you that these municipalities today are spending almost a quarter of a billion dollars a year for disposal facilities, doing everything they can to win a losing fight. They are spending a quarter of a billion dollars. How much has the Federal Government spent in the last 8 years under the existing law? Mr. Chairman, I will tell you—exactly \$11 million in 8 years of a program. Under existing law, which had authorized \$216,000,000.

You say that these municipalities are not exerting any effort. I think the figures I have given you are evidence that the States and municipalities are trying to exert every effort to solve a problem that has become a national problem.

So I do urge favorable consideration and adoption of section 6 when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule. Somebody has said that it would be unfair to those municipalities that have already built plants.

On this point that Federal construction grants would amount to penalizing the towns that have already built sewage-treatment works, there is this to be said:

For the most part, it is the downstream community which gets the greatest benefit from a sewage treatment plant. Therefore, cities which have built treatment plants will, in a great many instances, derive direct benefit from the construction grants provision. Take the case of the city of New York where they have already spent almost \$250 million for sewage treatment work facilities. There has been not one complaint from New York City. On the contrary, the mayor of New York City, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, who is president of the National Association of Municipalities, has repeatedly urged and encouraged that we adopt this grants-in-aid section 6 of the bill. The same is true of Chicago, which spent over \$300 million, and many other cities. Without section 6, all you have is a lot of words. Like the weather, as Mark Twain said, "everybody talks about it and nobody wants to do anything about it."

We have had words come from the other side of the aisle regarding policy, need, and so forth, but we are not interested in only words. Just as the President said to Russia that we want deeds, not words, the test here is, "By their deeds ye shall know them," not by words said on the floor.

Every day the equivalent of the raw, untreated sewage of every man, woman, and child in America is going into our rivers, streams, and lakes; and this is increasing year by year. We have more pollution today than we had 8 years ago when the Federal act first went into effect.

All this bill is going to do, and I am sorry to have to admit it, but such a modest request is just to keep us from falling further behind, to slow up this negative rate of retrogression. If we can succeed and come back 8 years from today, and say, "Ladies and gentlemen, we must report a wonderful accomplishment. Today our water smells only as bad as it did 8 years ago," if we have not worsened our Nation's waters any more than they are now, then we shall have been successful. That is the maximum goal, that is the maximum that can be accomplished by this bill, which is certainly a rockbottom minimum. So, anyone who is trying to exaggerate or distort this matter by saying that we are engaging in a gigantic program in which the Federal Government is going to take over the whole field of pollution abatement, of course, is just misleading and distorting the facts. We are just trying to prevent ourselves from slipping backward any further.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, who has been my good friend and close-working colleague these past 8 years.

Mr. PERKINS. First, I certainly wish to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota on his work before the subcommittee in bringing this bill to the floor of the House. I am particularly interested in section 6. If I correctly understand that section, a grant may be made up to \$300,000. Is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. Any modification or construction, and it could exceed \$900,000, but the most the Federal Government will match is one-third of the cost, not to exceed \$300,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Under section 6 it is provided that 50 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works, and so forth. This 50 percent is allocated to cities under 125,000 population. Is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is right. Of the \$50 million a year, 50 percent of that shall go to municipalities under 125,000; and I thank my good friend for his interest and support.

May I bring out just one more point. It was stated that many municipalities put sewage disposal at the bottom of their priority list; that hospitals, schools, airports, streets, parks, and other facilities come first. That is true to a large extent. But what happens? We have Federal aid now in almost every one of these, for airports, for hospitals, for schools, slum clearance, and housing. Look at the gigantic road program and urban extension roads for cities. So, for those projects which are already in a favorable priority position, we go ahead and make it more favorable with these Federal grants-in-aid funds, further pulling back on sewage-disposal projects that always had the lowest priorities.

I think it is a national disgrace that a country, such as ours, that has been blessed by the richest of resources, that we have in this country, should so shamefully neglect, mistreat, and foul up our waters as we have been doing for 200 years. The only thing that has saved us from a crisis long before this, and within the next 15 or 19 years just as sure as sour apples, we will reach that crisis; the only thing that has saved us so far is that we have had the good fortune to have such an abundance of surface water. As a Nation, we talk about technical assistance and economic aid to help raise the standard of living of people all over the world and to give them a little bit of hygiene and sanitation, yet how can we continue to have such an awful record here and be such an awful example to the rest of the world? Take a look at this polluted river, the Potomac River. This water in this glass is from the Potomac River. There are a lot of solids that have settled down at the bottom. Perhaps you cannot see too well, but I think you can see this much. Try to see the red line or band which is behind only 3½ inches of thickness of this polluted water. You cannot see an inch wide red line under a bright light through 3½ inches of this



glamorous, historic, traditionally rich Potomac River that flows right through Washington, a lovely city with parks and trees and gardens, the Capital City of America and of the world. It is one of the most shameful and disgraceful things we could have. We have this situation all over the country and not just in the Potomac. We have that problem all over the country.

This sample of polluted Potomac water has more things in it than you can shake a stick at. There are live bugs, little animals, little plants, and organic materials. There are solubles and insolubles and colloids and noncolloids and a whole lot of other things. It is really an interesting example.

Here is a specimen of clean treated water. It is a very unexciting specimen. There is really not much of interest in it. There is nothing much to it that you can see. You can see right through it. There is nothing there. It is colorless and odorless and tasteless outside of a little chlorine to kill some of the bugs. But even after it is treated, such as at the new plant that my good friend from Ohio and Cincinnati mentioned, they took the treated water that the people are drinking day in and day out and you extract that into a highly condensed concentrate and subject it to a chemical test—this is not propaganda—these bottles are from laboratories that have been chosen at random and you find this smelly residue from treated water that the people are drinking every day in Cincinnati, water which was taken out of the Ohio River. You ought to smell it. It is something the chemists do not even know what is in it and how to remove it and how to keep it out.

I do not mean to suggest that the American people are drinking unsafe water. The waterworks industry of this country has accomplished wonders in supplying our ever-increasing urban population with safe and palatable water, often from badly polluted raw water supplies.

I do say this situation is not one for complacency. Just holding our own in this pollution situation is not enough—and today we are not even holding our own.

We cannot go on indefinitely falling behind in the control of pollution without endangering the health and well-being of large numbers of people and finally the whole country.

Nor is it enough in this modern industrial world merely to have safe drinking water. We need more and more water for all purposes—for industry, for agriculture, for all kinds of municipal use—yes, and for recreation, for swimming and fishing and boating, for fish and wildlife.

It seems to me that we need to think not in terms of getting by but in terms of making it possible for our natural fresh water resources to serve all our needs.

That is why we are asking for more research funds and fellowships and scholarships in this bill. I have tried to point out the urgency of this. I have pointed out how our objectives are merely minimum. I do urge you to go along with this bill. The enactment of

this bill is important. It is long overdue. We have the broadest area of agreement with municipalities, conservation groups, health agencies, State organizations, the Federal Department of Health. We have the broadest support on this bill that we have ever had on any piece of legislation on this matter that has come before the Congress. The health and well-being of millions of our people are at stake. You cannot avoid a showdown on this. You can delay it and you can stall, but you cannot avoid a showdown. You have to have a showdown, just as certainly as we are sitting here today on this problem, by 1975.

So, as I said, the extent to which streams are being polluted is a national disgrace. We ask for a modest bill, a minimum of machinery and mechanism to rectify the situation. I say that to delay is to default. To delay is a reflection of our unwillingness to meet this problem head on, a problem that until now had us on retreat.

I hope we pass the bill H. R. 9540 as written.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am interested in the figure which you have arrived at on pages 14 and 15 of the bill, "At least 50 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or under." How do you arrive at the figure of 50 percent going to municipalities of that size? Did you determine that half of the people or more lived in communities of that size?

Mr. BLATNIK. We tried, as closely as possible, to find out where people lived. We did not have all the facts. The information was not available, but we tried to find out where the people lived, and in many of our smaller communities they have no treatment facilities. The larger cities can go into a thirty or forty million dollar proposition without too much difficulty. They have sanitary districts and other means by which they can raise revenues, as the gentleman described. Now that is as good an estimate as we could arrive at. We feel that after operating 2 years we will be in a better position to analyze the nature of the applications coming in, and make adjustments as necessary.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to see this safeguard in the bill for the smaller communities, where a greater financing problem does exist in taking care of this sewage, and where there is a large movement of heavy industry into those communities.

Mr. BLATNIK. We recognize the seriousness of this, particularly for large municipalities, but if we have 50 million and five large communities take it all away, there is nothing left for the smaller communities. The larger ones need help, but because of the attitude of some of the members of the committee, particularly on the minority side, all we have been given is a small amount, and we are spreading the crumbs around so that the big birds do not get all the crumbs and the little birds get none.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree with the gentleman, and I think the gentleman is pointing his finger directly at one of the most pressing problems we have today. It is appropriate recognition of a national responsibility for a national problem, and I am supporting this bill.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I am concerned with section 6 of this bill. I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he has made concerning the bill, but as I understand it, section 6 provides that there will be direct grants to municipalities, but controlled by State water commissions. Is that right?

Mr. BLATNIK. No; not controlled. The project has to be approved first by the State agency.

Mr. MORANO. That is a grant-in-aid direct to the municipality, with the approval of the State commission?

Mr. BLATNIK. It will be made direct to the municipality, but it will be approved by the State health agency, and they are working together with the Surgeon General. Previously there will be a comprehensive program for the water users to work out, and the Federal Government will be working with the State agencies involved, to conform with the need.

Mr. MORANO. The next question is, Does this bill say that 33 percent of the estimated cost of a project in a municipality will be paid by the Federal Government?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes, but not to exceed \$300,000.

Mr. MORANO. The bill authorizes an appropriation of \$50 million for each fiscal year.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes, each year for 10 years.

Mr. MORANO. And the aggregate amount is \$500 million with this program expected to continue for 10 years.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. The last question is: Has the Congress ever before authorized an appropriation and appropriated money for this specific purpose as contained in the bill now before us.

Mr. BLATNIK. In the period 1933 to 1939, Congress gave direct grants through PWA and WPA projects for disposal facilities.

Nothing was done until the existing law, the one that is about to expire at the end of this month, was passed 8 years ago. There was a section providing for loans of \$22,500,000, but no money was ever appropriated.

Mr. MORANO. Would it be accurate to say, if we enact this section, that it would be the first time we have specifically authorized the appropriation of money for this specific purpose?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. MORANO. It would be accurate to say that?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes; that is the record so far as I know.

Mr. MORANO. The other was just a blanket authorization not specifically directed to water pollution and the treatment of sewage.

Mr. BLATNIK. For public works generally.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I first want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota for the excellent job he has done as the chairman of the subcommittee and the splendid presentation he has made here today. He referred a few minutes ago to some Members on the other side of the aisle who might by inference object. I want to say to the gentleman, and if I am in error I want to be corrected, that I know of no one on either side of the aisle, or either side of the table of our committee who is opposed to the general principles of this legislation. We are taking exceptions to grants-in-aid.

I might call the gentleman's attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the first stream pollution control act passed by this Congress was passed by a Republican Congress, the 80th Congress; and we acknowledge the splendid support that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle gave us at that time.

I know of no objection to this legislation, the reenactment of existing law with some corrections.

The gentleman mentioned Cincinnati. I think that has been ably taken care of by the Member from Cincinnati, but I want to say that the praise for very fine things that he said that Cincinnati has done in cleaning this up is certainly deserved, for they did it with their own money. They even put on a 1-cent income tax on the people and they paid for it.

I reiterate that we favor this legislation but we cannot go along with the grants-in-aid. I again congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am very happy to clarify that. Perhaps in the haste of moving along rapidly I may have left, inadvertently, the wrong impression. We got excellent support from the gentleman's side of the aisle and from our side of the aisle on all but this financial aid section, the increasing of grants-in-aid.

In my view, however, these are the two most important sections of the bill, the enforcement and the grants-in-aid, the very heart of the bill.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to my neighbor from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I want to join with my distinguished colleague and neighbor in supporting this program. I think it is one of the most important bills this Congress has considered since we met here in January.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota, my friend and neighbor, this question: Without section 6, without Federal aid, does he think this bill really would mean anything to the people in America?

Mr. BLATNIK. Without this section 6, which I said was the heart of the bill, it would amount to very little. Section 6 provides the tools to carry out the objectives provided after research has pointed out what is necessary to be

done. Without section 6 the bill would be about as effective as a person rapping on the windowpane with a wet sponge; no one would hear him. It would be about that effective.

Without this section I predict we will come back here 6 years from now in exactly the same situation we are in today except that the water-pollution problem will have grown steadily worse and again we will say that the pollution mess in our water is worse than it was 8 years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has an outstanding record in behalf of conservation and national resource use.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota on the wonderful statement he has made. I would like to associate myself with his views to state that I have received letters from various organizations and individuals in the Ninth District and in the State of Wisconsin endorsing a strong water pollution control bill, such as the one Congressman BLATNIK is sponsoring.

I am glad to say that I introduced a similar bill, H. R. 5897, on April 27, 1955, and that this bill contained section 6 authorizing the Surgeon General to extend financial aid in the form of grants, loans, or both to any State or municipality for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge by such State or municipality of untreated or inadequately treated sewage. I am very much in favor of retaining section 6 in H. R. 9540 as the grants-in-aid provision is needed to put teeth into the legislation.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, my good friend and neighbor in northern Minnesota.

Mrs. KNUTSON. I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from Minnesota for his excellent presentation and in revealing the seriousness of this problem. I sincerely urge the support of all Members of the House of this piece of legislation.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota on his very splendid presentation. In my service as a Member of this House I have not seen a better presentation on any subject matter. I think it is well for those who assert that they believe in the principle of this program of stream pollution control to recognize the fact that the history of the previous legislation indicated that it was effective legislation only when there was a grant-in-aid program tied in with it. Many are losing sight of the fact that a number of municipalities would not be in a position to participate in such a program without some sort of Federal aid. The larger cities have greater taxing capacity. They have done a splendid job. They have

invested millions of dollars in this program. But even their work will be adversely affected unless the smaller communities up the line of these rivers are able to participate wholeheartedly and fully in the program. They cannot now do that without some form of Federal aid. Just with reference to the matter of water systems, many small communities today are forced to forego a water system because they do not have the taxing capacity to support them. If you really believe in the principle of this program you have to show interest and you have to show that interest by putting the Federal participation in it backed up with Federal dollars.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], a member of our committee, in commending the gentleman for his handling of this bill in the subcommittee during its consideration. The crux of the entire matter and the issue over which there is any dispute at all is the matter of grants-in-aid to the States. I note that the gentleman says \$172 million were expended last year, or in recent years in each year, by municipalities in the building of sewage treatment plants. Let us assume that these municipalities will continue that work at an accelerated pace of 50 percent. That would call for an expenditure of \$258 million as against the present \$172 million. In that event the Federal Government would contribute \$86 million, or it could under section 6. In other words, if we just increase the work we are now doing by one-third it would involve more than the \$50 million carried in this bill. I think the gentleman should explain to the House how the \$50 million is going to accelerate and increase the program rather than hold it back, because that is the argument that will be made against it.

Mr. BLATNIK. When we get to consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule I will be glad to answer that question.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HYDE. Under section 3 (b) consent of Congress is given to a State to enter into interstate compacts. It is the gentleman's understanding that will also give the States which are already operating under a compact the authority to amend those compacts so that they might take advantage of any of the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. I know of no reason why they cannot amend or improve them and this provision is to encourage them to enter into such agreements.

Mr. HYDE. One other question. The argument has been made, as I understand, that if section 6 is deleted it would make the enforcement provisions practically worthless, because the communities would not be able to comply with them. Well, under the Interstate



Sanitary Commission operating in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut—and I understand very successfully—they have an enforcement provision in that compact, and so far I understand they have not even had to go to court on any of them. They have been successful in enforcing it. And their communities finance their own projects, do they not?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman and congratulate him and his colleagues who have labored so diligently to bring us this proposed legislation. I sincerely hope it passes. I would like to say to the gentleman that I have several communities in my district in Florida who have written to me about this legislation, and I am particularly pleased that those of us who represent the little towns and the little communities have an opportunity here, I think, to be of practical help to our people. Again I want to congratulate the gentleman and associate myself with him.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for his considerate and thoughtful remarks.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9540. This piece of legislation, to my way of thinking, is one of the most important bills that has come before this body in a long time. The municipalities all over the country are vitally concerned about water pollution and we must do something about the problem. The grants in Federal aid provided for in section 6 certainly should remain in the bill. The committee report recommends that the Water Pollution Control Act be extended and strengthened which is scheduled to expire June 30.

The report noted that reliable estimates indicate the Nation will require, by 1975, an increase in current water supply of 145 percent. This is equal to the additional supply of 120 cities the size of New York City. It would require the flow of about 11 Colorado Rivers, or equal the flow of Niagara Falls.

In meeting these increasing demands the control of pollution has an essential role; it is the key to the national problem of water supply, for polluted water is wasted water.

House Report 2190 of the 84th Congress, in favoring passage of the bill, noted that it would: First, authorize continuation of Federal-State cooperation in the development of water pollution control programs; second, increase technical assistance to States particularly on new and complex problems; third, intensify and broaden research to determine the effects of pollutants on public health and other waste uses and to develop fair and more economical methods of waste treatment; fourth, in-

crease aid to the conduct of and grants for demonstrations, studies and training; fifth, broaden matching grants to States and interstate agencies for the construction of needed treatment works; sixth, continue encouragement of interstate cooperation; seventh, assist in the development of improved State water pollution control legislation; eighth, improve procedures for State-interstate-Federal collaboration on abatement of interstate pollution; and ninth, encourage prevention and control of pollution from Federal installation.

Section 6 of the bill provides for grants to States, municipalities, and other agencies, to help in the preliminary planning and construction of needed sewage treatment. This I regard as one of the key provisions of the bill and of utmost importance to our already tax-burdened municipalities.

As amended in the subcommittee which conducted thorough hearings on the bill, the section would provide Federal assistance to any one municipality up to one-third of the cost of sewage treatment facilities, or \$300,000, whichever is smaller. At least 50 percent of such grants would be earmarked for aid to communities of 125,000 population or less. An appropriation of \$50 million per year for such grants would be authorized by this section of the bill, to an aggregate not to exceed \$500 million over a period of years. Grants are to be made only for projects approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency and the Surgeon General of the United States, and for projects included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to the terms of the bill, priority to be given to grants for advance planning.

That this is vitally needed is demonstrated by the evidence produced during the hearing that there is a backlog of sewage treatment needs amounting to \$2 billion.

The predicament of the small city, for which section 6 offers some hope, was graphically presented by witness after witness during the hearings on this bill. It was testified that many communities have reached their legal limits of bonded indebtedness. Many are limited as to their tax resources and expenditures by State law. In city after city it was declared that their financial resources have been strained to the utmost by their current needs for such essential services as schools, water supply, police, and fire-protective services. They have simply exhausted their resources in many instances. And still the grave and increasing problem of providing sewage-treatment facilities has to be met.

The small or medium-sized city of up to 50,000 population, largely dependent upon one industry which contributes largely to water pollution, is at an additional disadvantage. In the event of a period of relatively depressed activity within that industry, the tax income available for public purposes decreases. The municipality is unable to attract new industry to provide a diversified tax base as it is unable to offer ample quantities of pure water upon which most modern industry is so dependent. So

with lessened ability to meet the cost, they are met with the absolute need for construction of sewage-treatment facilities in order to attract new industry.

A spokesman for 35,000 municipalities, Robert Weatherford, American Municipal Association, has said that American cities are not looking for something for nothing. Anything they can finance they will finance. They are just not able to finance sewage-treatment plants fast enough. He said that at the present "we are losing the battle against water pollution. The only way we can win this battle is with Federal aid."

It is apparent that at the present rate of construction of sewage-treatment facilities that we are not only not making progress in solving the water-pollution problem, but are losing ground. There is the existing backlog of \$2 billion worth of absolutely minimum construction. To this must be added the additional pollution which will result in the future from increased population, from new industries, and obsolescence of many existing treatment plants. It is truly a matter of public safety and health.

We have, on the one hand, a vast and dangerously increasing problem and on the other an equally increasing inability of the municipality to fully cope with this problem. Passage of this bill, H. R. 9540, by the Congress will go far toward an eventual solution. Especially needed and essential to the complete program is section 6, for grants to municipalities for advanced planning and construction of sewage-treatment facilities.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay tribute to and compliment my able colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation. His presentation here on the floor of this bill has been excellent. No one could fail to understand the problem if he had listened carefully to what he had to say.

It is not pleasant, Mr. Chairman, to disagree with your chairman, and I do not disagree with him in principle. We are simply in disagreement on one section of the bill and there are good reasons for that disagreement. We, on the Republican side of the aisle, I am sure are in complete accord with the object of the bill, and the fundamental principles involved in it and the effort which the Federal Government is putting forth to see if we can solve this difficult problem of pollution of the waters of the United States. It is not a new subject. It has been here before. I have a personal interest in this bill, because 10 years ago, Mr. Chairman, in the 80th Congress there was presented to us Senate 418, amended by the House, which was the Nation's first comprehensive water pollution program enacted into law, and that became Public Law 845. A little of the history of that bill I think is in order at this point.

I might say that Senate 418 was introduced by the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, and the late Senator Barkley, of Kentucky. It was a bipartisan bill. There was no political approach to it at all. The Committee on Public Works of the House in the 80th Congress held ex-

tensive hearings on that bill as well as on H. R. 123, H. R. 315, and H. R. 470. There were several bills introduced. I had the privilege, as chairman of the committee, to appoint a subcommittee to study and bring back to the full committee recommendations for a stream pollution abatement bill. That was done, and a bill was perfected, passed, and became the first general law that we have had in the United States to deal with this very difficult subject of water pollution.

Now, I say that there are some reasons why we differ on section 6.

First of all, the water resources commission of my State is opposed to section 6 of this bill.

Secondly, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, when they filed their written report on this proposed legislation with our committee, stated in no uncertain terms that they believed section 6 should be deleted. They are opposed to it.

In addition to that, may I say that so far as section 6 is concerned, there was no great demand—certainly not before our committee—shown on the part of municipalities throughout the country indicating that it was needed or that it was necessary. So there is a basis for our difference of opinion.

As to the remaining portions of the bill, I want to join my colleagues in supporting it. I believe that every member of our committee, regardless of which side of the aisle he is on, desires to support it.

If I wanted to use the illustration that has been presented here today of the city of Cincinnati, all I can say is this. If we had 3 projects like Cincinnati, it would exhaust the \$50 million provided for annual Federal aid, and that would be the end of it. This is a big country. \$500 million or even \$1 billion that was provided in the original bill would only scratch the surface. So that we are not embarking upon a financial program by the Federal Government with any idea that it is going to solve the problem. I can say this to the House and to every Member of the House, that during the last 10 years, since the enactment of the bill that is now on the books, and which will expire on June 30, tremendous progress has been made. I do not know what has happened in your section of the land, but in my part of the United States municipalities, large and small, have undertaken to solve this problem themselves, without asking aid from the Federal Government. And it can be done, in my opinion, without section 6 in this bill.

Here we are launching this Government upon a new program of expenditure that, when the next session of Congress comes around, will not be \$50 million a year, but do not be surprised if it is increased 5 or 10 times that much, because the more that is given, the more will be asked.

I want to answer my chairman in regard to the \$22½ million in the former bill. I think he was mistaken, of course not intentionally. That is in reference to the \$22½ million provided in the original bill passed in the 80th Congress.

Is it not a fact that the Committee on Appropriations of this House never appropriated a dollar and that is why no loans were made? If there were any demands made, I do not know of them; I have never heard of them. But that is the real truth of it, even though it provided low 2 percent interest on the loans made.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, I yield to my chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman is correct. The Committee on Appropriations never did appropriate any money. But my statement was that under the provisions of that authorization, not a single bit of Federal help was given to any of the municipalities in the last 8 years. And furthermore, if you go into the record of the Committee on Appropriations—they held hearings on this—you will find that they had such serious misgivings about the workability of the existing act that is now on the statute books that they said this enforcement provision cannot be worked out, cannot be carried out. And so they refused to make an appropriation.

Mr. DONDERO. If my able colleague believes that \$50 million a year is all that is necessary to solve the problem in the United States, we would not be arguing here today very much. But this is just a door-opener. It is a foot in the door for millions upon millions and more, all to be paid by the Federal Government to do what the States, the cities and the municipalities should and can do themselves.

There are some tightening-up provisions in this bill, particularly as to the arm of enforcement. I agree with them. I want to support them. I am going to support them. And so will every member of the committee on the Republican side of the aisle as well as the Democratic side. This is not a political bill. This is a bill attempting to do something to benefit the people of the United States. I think it can be done without involving the Federal Government in untold millions of expenditures to come from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. My understanding is that the gentleman has made the statement, and I think we all realize it is true, that this \$50 million will merely scratch the surface. Is there any formula by which these funds are to be allocated to the various communities that would determine which part of the surface is going to be scratched?

Mr. DONDERO. No, there is not, except that 50 percent of the amount provided in the bill will go to communities of 125,000 population or less. The other 50 percent can be distributed by the department which will administer this legislation.

I want to read to the House the language on which I base my argument against section 6. I am reading from the minority views filed on this bill. You will find this in the written report of

the department. This is what is stated on page 31, referring to the department:

We would not favor the grant proposal contained in H. R. 9540 and we would recommend amendment of the bill to delete the provisions of section 6.

There is no question on where they stand and why they think it should be taken out of this bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, not so long ago I came upon a very learned treatise on this general subject of water supply protection. May I read you one brief passage from that treatise:

There are (areas) which can now keep nothing but bees but which, not so very long ago . . . produced boundless (nurture for civilization). The annual supply of rainfall was not lost, as it is at present . . . (but) was able to discharge the drainage of the heights into the hollows in the form of springs and rivers. . . . The shrines (of decayed civilization) that survive the present day on the sites of extinct water supplies are evidence of the correctness of my present hypothesis.

Does that sound to you as though it had been written by a Democrat or by a Republican? I am afraid I cannot tell you because those words were written by a man named Plato who lived 400 years before Christ.

If recent years have taught us nothing else, surely they have taught us that in this advancing civilization of ours there is no commodity which is more important to our future than water. For water is not merely a commodity used to float battleships and bathe children and run mills. Water is life itself. I am convinced that the time is rapidly approaching in much of the United States when that community which is blessed by an adequate supply of usable water will be in a far more advantageous position than that community with oil or gold or uranium or any other resource of the earth but lacking water.

The committee has made an effort to approach this problem of water pollution, which is presenting one of the principal deterrents to keeping pace with our growing water needs, with as broad-scale and comprehensive a plan as it could possibly devise.

The objection of the gentlemen to section 6 of the bill reminds me somewhat of a poem the late G. K. Chesterton wrote, in which he said:

The Christian social union here  
Was very much annoyed—  
It seems there is some duty which  
We never should avoid.  
So we sang a lot of hymns  
To help the unemployed.

Of course, we all know that problems such as unemployment and water pollution will not be solved merely by the singing of hymns; nor can they in reality be solved merely by the passage of resolutions or merely by the appointment of study commissions or merely by investigations and research.

If we are going to stop pollution of the Nation's streams, we have to stop it at the source where it begins. Perhaps you may be wondering why it is that the Federal Government finds it



desirable and necessary to grant funds to municipalities. Are they not, after all, supposed to be self-supporting? Well, that is a fair question, and I think it deserves a fair answer.

Perhaps I can provide at least a partial answer from my own experience. It was my privilege for 4½ years to serve as mayor of a growing municipality in Texas and for one of those years to serve as president of the League of Texas Municipalities which represents some 672 incorporated cities, towns and villages.

The reason grants to municipalities are necessary to the achievement of the desired result is that the cities are the orphan children of American government. The reason they have not been able adequately to solve their pollution problems is that they have had neither the financial resources nor the legal means in many instances to raise the necessary revenues. The municipalities have been caught in a squeeze between rising costs and severely restricted sources of revenue. Most of our cities are growing. Growth means costly extensions of such things as sewer lines, water lines, paved streets, police protection and fire protection. Growth does not pay for itself, at least not for the first 20 or 25 years. Yet, confronted with these rising costs and the rising unit costs of providing these things for their citizens, the tax sources from which the cities of our Nation had traditionally until the last 25 or 30 years supported the needs of their communities have been preempted by the States and primarily by the Federal Government. Now, if we are going to look down the throat of a city and say, "Here, clean up your own backyard," then, we must in turn do something practical to make it possible for that city to clean up its own backyard.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I also desire to pay high compliment to the chairman of our subcommittee for the amount of work that he has done on this bill. We are thoroughly in accord with the purpose of extending the pollution act. We went along with raising the money for educational and scientific investigations. But there is a principle involved in this bill, particularly in section 6, that many of us cannot see our way clear to go along with. There is no dispute among any of us, I believe, on the proposition that we must conserve our waters. There is no dispute that we should control stream pollution and that was my thought as to the necessity for the passage of this bill. In other words, to improve the Federal control in order to enforce the proper regulations to prevent the contamination of our streams.

I believe we have accomplished that in this bill. I believe we have given to the Federal Government the authority to enforce the law and to stop States from dumping their sewage into the streams that will pollute the water of the users downstream. There is no dispute there. I think the bill will accomplish that.

No one is more in favor of seeing that the water of our streams is properly preserved for human use and fish and wildlife than I, but when we endeavor to embark on such a large program of more Federal grants, I think we are proceeding in the wrong direction. The original bill 8 years ago provided some \$22.5 million for grants to States. The Appropriations Committee has made no appropriation in the 8 years since the bill was passed. Now we are going to authorize a new program, if section 6 remains in the bill, for a large sum of money. Not a dollar of that money will be available unless the Appropriations Committees and the Congress appropriate the money. That will mean it will be at least 2 years that all these cities that are proposing sewage disposal plants will be waiting for the money to be appropriated. We would be aggravating a situation in this country if we carry this section in the bill. I think we are going in the wrong direction. We are going to encourage pollution rather than stop it. I feel that this bill is a proper bill. I feel we should in all good grace eliminate section 6, and go ahead with the extension of this program, which will mean that we can give to the cities and States the proper amount of technical advice so as to improve the sanitary condition.

I do not believe that many of the cities have raised the amount of money they could raise. One community will take care of its sewage; another will not. The assessed valuations are different in the various cities and counties and States. If you desire to be equitable in the distribution of the Federal taxpayer's money, you should have a uniform assessed value throughout the entire country, so you will give each community or section of the State an equitable portion of the money. The cities are all willing to have a fine water system, a good fire department, and good streets, good lighting, and so forth, but when it comes to sewage disposal they say, "Well, let the fellow downstream worry about it." That is not fair. The very best measuring stick you could provide for sewage disposal are the users of the system and in each of the cities in accordance with their population. Section 6 should be deleted and the bill passed as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I think it has been truthfully established that the committee, both the majority and the minority, are entirely in accord with the provisions of this bill, and the necessity for enacting a Water Pollution Act.

I think the committee is unanimous in giving appreciation to our good chairman, Mr. BLATNIK, for the conduct of the hearings and the fairness with which everyone was heard.

I am in opposition to section 4, grants-in-aid.

There are many problems involved in this particular bill. All the emotion stresses the necessity of water; all the emotion stresses against the pollution of water streams, but I wonder how

many know that when we were holding the hearings there were States that even failed to pass water pollution acts? Because of that they want Congress to appropriate money to give grants-in-aid to cities, and so forth, to alleviate water pollution.

Our good friend mentioned the city of New York, and Bob Wagner, the mayor, a former colleague of mine in the New York State Assembly. He said he endorsed these grants-in-aid. How he can do this I do not know. New York City would get nothing from this bill. Let it be known that the city of New York is greatly in debt. Through the years the city of New York finds it necessary, year after year, to go to the New York State Legislature and ask for new laws for taxing purposes, to provide facilities for the people of the city of New York. Those requests have been granted from time to time.

It was a Republican-controlled legislature and Republican Governor of the State of New York that bailed the city of New York out of its transit problem when it was losing \$50 million a year or more on the city transit system. I am very happy to say that under the new transit authority the city of New York today shows a very different story and a very marked improvement. In the recent report of the transit commission they show a \$10 million surplus as against staggering losses throughout the past years.

Outside of the city of New York in my own county we are spending tens of millions of dollars on sewerage-construction work obtained out of the sale of revenue bonds. How is it being done? It is being done because the State legislature, just as in the case of the city of New York, enacted special legislation to permit us to issue revenue-producing bonds outside our normal debt limit, and because of that we have been able to proceed with the necessary sewerage construction and reduce water pollution.

That same thing happened in the city of New York time and time again where the State legislature changed the law to permit the issuance of bonds by the city of New York outside its normal debt limit.

We heard testimony before this committee that various municipalities had reached their debt limit or where because of some other unknown factor they could not raise the necessary money because the State law would not permit. I asked the Representatives of one of our States if the legislature could not change the law, and they replied that they have not asked the State for a change.

There is one point I want to make clear and I think I can do so without offense to anyone if they will think the proposition through carefully and clearly. We have heard much lamentation recently over decisions of the United States Supreme Court overriding our State laws on secession, our right to eliminate Communists or fifth-amendment Communists from holding jobs in our school system, and several other decisions of the United States Supreme Court: Wailing, lamentations, and tears over these decisions and invasions of States rights,

but when it comes to grants-in-aid, when it comes to getting money from the Federal Government, we forget our State responsibilities to take care of our own needs, to take care of our own wants, the health of our own people.

We forget about the fact that coupled with States rights is States responsibility. States rights work both ways: If we want the State to be left alone to take care of things within State borders, then, by the same token, we should also say that in respect to money needed that that is their responsibility.

I hope section 6 is deleted from the bill, in the best interests of control of water pollution.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], a member of the committee.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the members of the committee that I think this is a good bill, a very good bill; and I include section 6 in that opinion. I also want to congratulate the chairman of our committee for the excellent way in which our hearings were conducted. I consider it a great privilege to serve under him. I hope I will serve with him for many years to come, although I do not know how long I want his party to continue as the majority.

Let us take a look at this section 6. What does it do? It appealed to me very much, and I was responsible for the amendment of section 6 in the committee. It appealed to me because it is an opportunity given to aid small communities to take care of this very difficult problem of stream pollution which is becoming more intricate every day on account of the industrial wastes which are being dumped into our streams.

Now what does the section further provide? It provides that a Federal grant may be given to a community that is ready to pay for at least two-thirds of the cost of a project. The Federal grant is only one-third of the cost and no appropriation or authorization could possibly be considered unless a municipality or the State itself was ready to pay two-thirds of the cost of the project. In addition to that, let me point out section 6 provides that at least 50 percent of the overall funds so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works, and servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or under. This will enable the smaller communities throughout the country to do their share in clearing up this pollution problem.

Reference has been made to the previous legislation. I may say that I served on that subcommittee which wrote that bill. Under that legislation loans were authorized. It has been pointed out that no money has ever been appropriated for loans, but no municipality or no State has really come forward to ask to borrow money for such purpose.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. It did not work because the municipalities realized that they could not proceed to finance the con-

struction of the facilities due to the fact that the Federal proposal was not liberal enough to give them the necessary assistance?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I think so.

Mr. BAILEY. The loans were only for 10 years.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. That is a true statement.

Mr. BAILEY. They would have to have 30 years to finance it from the revenues of the installation.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. The provisions of section 6 would not permit the Federal throwing away of money. A great many steps have to be taken before any such grant is given.

I hope the committee will retain section 6 in the bill and I say that with a certain feeling of regret because I do not like to be on the opposite side of the fence from my very dear friend and colleague whom I respect so highly, the gentleman from Michigan, who has been such a great power and strength in our committee for many years. He will be missed in the days to come and I am one of those who, if reelected, will miss him more than anybody else on the floor.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with those who have paid tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee which has brought this legislation to the floor. The gentleman who serves as chairman of the subcommittee has worked diligently and has spent a tremendous number of hours in getting this legislation into the form in which it now appears and in bringing it here for our consideration. It was his leadership that caused our committee to have additional days of hearings during the present session so that everyone who wanted to be heard would have the opportunity to be heard on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to a section which has not come in for too much discussion today, but which I think is a tremendously important section so far as progress in water pollution control is concerned. That is section 8 which deals with enforcement measures against the pollution of interstate waters. The present Federal law provides that enforcement of action against a polluter at the present time can only take place if consent is given not only by the State which is polluted by the action, but also by the State which is the polluting State.

It seems to me that because of that particular provision in the existing law we have legislation which, when it comes to a test, would fail in many cases simply because the polluting State will not give the agreement that would be required. The committee has made a tremendous forward step in improving the water pollution control legislation. It has changed this provision and has now provided that the Attorney General of the United States is given authority to bring action to enforce control measures against a polluter upon the request of just 1 of those 2 States; in other words, if the request comes purely from the State which is polluted, the Attorney General can go forward and bring suit to see that corrective action is taken

against the polluting agency in the other State which is involved. In my opinion, this is probably the greatest single forward step from the standpoint of enforcement that is involved in this whole bill.

Conservation groups and organizations throughout the United States have commended the committee because of their action in putting in this additional enforcement provision. I happened to have the opportunity a number of years ago as an attorney to represent a number of people who were being hurt by pollution on a stream, and to me it was an amazing thing to see how the action of a mine upstream, in this particular instance, could practically kill off enterprise downstream, including recreational facilities that might be using the water for a swimming pool or resort as well as farmers who might be using the water to water their livestock and every other person downstream who was dependent upon that stream for water. They practically had all their rights taken away by the action of one polluter upstream. That is the type of thing that this legislation is basically designed to attack. We are getting into a more complicated type of era with more and more people depending on the waters of these streams. In connection with interstate waters crossing State lines as well as lakes that border two or more States we will give the Federal Government, through this bill, the opportunity to take effective action necessary to correct pollution and make it possible for the people of this country to use the water in its natural form.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this legislation that has for its purpose the cleaning up of our rivers from the filth and pollution which now is so prevalent in many of our streams. As this bill seeks to do that, I will support it. I am in favor of its objectives in this respect. However, I do feel that certain portions of the bill could be amended to advantage without destroying its usefulness in accomplishing the purpose of cleaning up our rivers from the pollution that now exists.

I have particularly in mind the Delaware River. At one time within my memory this was a beautiful stream with clear and unpolluted water. Today it has become a stench in certain portions as a result of the dumping of raw sewage into it. The city of Camden and other municipalities on the New Jersey side, and some on the Pennsylvania side, are engaged in expensive operation to eliminate this improper disposal of raw sewage. We can look forward to the day, although it may be distant, when the waters of the Delaware River will again be clean as it once was.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage efforts of municipalities to undertake operations such as this by a partial grant of Federal funds to meet the expense of



such projects in conjunction with local participation.

The bill as reported reaffirms the policy of the Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution.

The bill would authorize, first, continuation of Federal-State cooperation in the development of water-pollution control programs; second, increased technical assistance to States particularly on new and complex problems; third, intensified and broadened research to determine the effects of pollutants on public health and other water used and to develop better and more economical methods of waste treatment; fourth, increased aid through the conduct of and grants for demonstrations, studies, and training; fifth, broadened matching grants to States and interstate agencies for their water-pollution control programs; sixth, matching grants to municipalities, States, and interstate agencies for the construction of needed treatment works; seventh, continued encouragement of interstate cooperation; eighth, assistance in the development of improved State water-pollution control legislation; ninth, improved procedures for State-interstate-Federal collaboration on abatement of interstate pollution; and, tenth, encouragement of prevention and control of pollution from Federal installations.

In meeting increasing demands for water, the control of pollution has an essential role in the Nation's water-resources problem. Pollution is a waste of water. The greater the degree of pollution, the greater is the waste. Pollution can be just as effective in reducing a water resource for use as drought. Pollution control, therefore, is now recognized as a key to the national problem of water conservation. Pollution control will permit the use of the river water as it flows from its source to the sea.

This has been a subject that has been before Congress for many years. It should have congressional approval. It will mean much to the health and comfort of our citizens. It should not be delayed.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a couple of minutes' time to discuss an amendment that I intend to offer when amendments are in proper order, and I think it is an amendment that has been approved by both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the significance of the section to which it refers, and that is section 6. In the italicized portion of section (e) on page 15 you will note there is the following wording in defining "construction" included "preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works."

In addition to that, with regard to the expenditure under this section of the \$50 million a year, which is presently under some debate, as Federal grants, there is a proviso that was added on my motion in committee in addition to the previous

proviso that I have just read to the following effect:

That is assuring that a fair distribution of grant funds hereunder is made available to the largest possible number of States, municipalities, intermunicipal or interstate agencies that have need for treatment works and in order that the initial feasibility of a project can be determined, the Surgeon General shall give priority to grants for advance planning in order to determine the preliminary economic and engineering feasibility of such project.

That will be clarified by my further amendment so that the minimum amount involved is 10 percent in this particular advance planning portion of the program, the reason for that being that if the words presently in the bill remain without this additional amendment, there is a question of tying up all of the funds and not permitting the Surgeon General to go ahead with the grant-in-aid program, and therefore I agreed with the amendment as proposed. I want to suggest to the House that so far as I can determine the position of some of the minority members of the committee is contrary to the suggestion that has been made by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee to the effect that the Members on the left side of the aisle have been in opposition to any Federal aid or assistance in this program. I want to call attention of the House to the fact that in the committee those on the left side of the aisle unanimously supported a compromise proposal on section 6 that would have provided, instead of the \$50 million a year grant, a program of \$10 million a year grant for advance planning and engineering, which is what this advance planning proviso in section 6 now does, anyway. And in addition to that it would have reinstated the \$22½ million program which is in the present law and which is deleted not only by this bill but also by the Senate bill, S. 890, that was passed there and sent over to the House for our consideration.

So I suggest to you that this proviso which was inserted in the bill on my motion provides that in order to get maximum distribution of funds throughout the entire United States, to the maximum number of municipalities and Government agencies involved—and that is going to be a real problem—some substantial funds should be made available for advance-planning purposes. The significance of it is this. The municipalities obviously do not like to accept their own full responsibility in providing sewage-disposal programs anyway, because they are not glamorous enough in comparison to some other types of public works projects. I go along with the idea of trying to provide some incentive that would encourage them to accept their responsibility in this kind of a program. But they do not give needed priority to sewage-disposal programs because they do not have enough glamor. So it has been difficult to get them to go into these programs. One of the fundamental reasons has to do with preliminary, advance planning, that is, with determining whether a project is economically and engineeringly feasible, and there the agencies have to spend tax money for advance planning

before they can even go into a bond issue. That is risk money. If the bond issue does not prove feasible, they lose that money and have to explain to the taxpayers why they spent that money, in effect, without getting results. This proposal which I have advanced to provide advance-planning money is intended to provide aid to local agencies in getting sewage treatment plant programs initially under way.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a fact that the Senate bill, S. 890, did not contain the provisions of section 6 of the House bill?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. It came to us without that section?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. And again with regard to the people on the left side of the aisle, the sewage-treatment program and the water-pollution program was a recommendation of the President of the United States a year ago. He recommended air-pollution legislation; he recommended water-pollution legislation. And last year we did pass air-pollution legislation and I am very glad to see us doing something about water-pollution legislation this year, in this session of Congress.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Do I understand that the gentleman's amendment would make certain that 10 percent of the amount authorized in this bill would be used for advance planning?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And is the gentleman's amendment limited to that objective alone?

Mr. CRAMER. It prevents the existing advance planning proviso from being limited to advance planning alone, by making a minimum of 10 percent available for advance planning in the discretion of the Surgeon General. It prevents doing the very thing the gentleman is concerned about, that is, the unnecessary limitation on grant expenditures and that I, too, was concerned about when it was called to my attention and when I agreed to this proposed modification of my advance-planning amendment which was unanimously adopted in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in the Water Pollution Act in the State of Michigan for many years. I believe it was in 1930 that Michigan enacted the Water Pollution Act and put it under the control of the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

I should like to inquire of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] as to what effect this bill would have, if enacted into law, with the exception of section 6, on the Michigan Water Pollution

Act that we now have, which has been passed on by the Supreme Court, the decision there being that the Water Resources Commission had full authority to enforce the provisions of the Michigan act.

Mr. DONDERO. The general purpose of the bill, of course, is to tighten up the control and also the enforcement provisions of the antipollution law as we now have it. If the State law takes care of things within the State they would have a right to proceed under the State law. If it did not furnish the relief, they could still come under the Federal law, if this bill passes.

Mr. KNOX. The gentleman undoubtedly is acquainted with the Michigan Pollution Act, is he not?

Mr. DONDERO. Not too thoroughly; but somewhat.

Mr. KNOX. The Supreme Court handed down its decision that the Michigan Water Resources Commission had full authority to impose upon cities the duty of constructing sewage disposal plants so that I believe we now have a law in Michigan that serves all of the purposes so far as pollution of rivers and streams is concerned.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct, and I may say great progress has been made in Michigan to clean up the waters of our State under that law and the previous antipollution law of the Federal Government. They are doing a great job under that law now, I know that.

Mr. KNOX. May I say also to the gentleman from Michigan, as we are both from Michigan, that we have some international boundaries and we have waters that are known as international waters. Is there any provision in this bill which is being presented to us here today to take care of the international situation?

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt that very much. That would come under the treaty existing between the United States and Canada. Canada is the country with whom we have our territorial borders and international waters.

Mr. KNOX. Is the gentleman of the opinion there is no legislation needed to control the international waters?

Mr. DONDERO. I made no such statement, but I do say that it would come under the treaty between the United States and Canada on that subject. It has not been rigidly enforced and we know that, because both nations may be polluting the international waters. I am satisfied, however, that both nations will take steps to solve the problem.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. A question has been asked on a matter with which I happen to be familiar. We are agreed here that our State of Michigan is perhaps one of the foremost in its attacks on pollution. This bill has been given very careful consideration by the committee to preserve the rights of States, the rights of participants in interstate and intermunicipal compacts, and also not to infringe upon treaties between the United States and other countries.

The bill first of all is set up to handle pollution in waters that flow along or across State boundaries. As such, there is very little of that kind of water within the State of Michigan. But there is an adequate safeguard in this bill which provides for what is tantamount to a waiting period of almost 18 months before there is any Federal action. During that 18 months the State has every opportunity possible to act to clean up whatever pollution may exist within its boundaries or these interstate waters. There is also a provision in the bill whereby Federal action will be delayed indefinitely and at the same time the State where the pollution exists is making some effort to clean up the pollution.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, certainly this problem of pollution of our streams throughout the Nation and its effect on the recreation, sports, and health of our people has become a most serious problem. Something must be done. We certainly cannot turn our head or stick our heads in the sand and expect the problem to solve itself. I am in sympathy with a lot of the views that have been expressed here today about anything in this bill or some parts of this bill being an infringement upon States rights. Certainly, if I felt any parts of the bill were an infringement on States rights, I would oppose it, because I am a States righter myself. However, we must recognize that this problem of pollution of our streams is somewhat of an interstate matter. These streams or practically all of them run through several States and there are several scattered jurisdictions involved. Most certainly there has to be some coordinated action to tie these States and these communities in together before we will ever begin to approach any sort of solution of the problem whatsoever. I believe this bill is possibly the minimum action that this Congress can take in the direction of helping to clear some of this pollution problem all over the country. Possibly, some of the Members of this body come from areas which are not involved or which are not suffering from the problem of pollution, and they may not be too familiar with it.

The problems involved in pollution control and abatement which are drawing more and more attention throughout the Nation are focused on the situation facing us today at our doorstep. Here, in the Washington metropolitan area, with the population growing by leaps and bounds, unless coordinated remedial action is taken to insure safe and adequate water supplies for the future and provide clean rivers for recreation and other uses, we will not keep pace with the needs of either this area or the Nation. It is to invite attention to these urgent needs that I rise in support of this bill. I have introduced H. R. 8108 which is, I believe, compatible with the spirit of the national legislation being considered by the House today to extend and strengthen a cooperative program for pollution control.

This national program is now being carried on by the State and interstate

pollution-control agencies with the assistance of the Public Health Service. We are fortunate to have already functioning the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, whose primary mission it is to encourage the abatement of pollution in the Potomac River Basin and through such encouragement to bring about optimum use of the basin's waters. This Commission was formulated by legislative acts of the four States concerned, the District of Columbia, and the Congress. It has worked closely with authorities or governing bodies of the District of Columbia, adjacent Maryland jurisdictions, Arlington, and Fairfax Counties, Va., and the city of Alexandria, on all aspects of the pollution problem and also with the various Federal agencies concerned.

Just a word as to why a pollution problem exists in the Washington area when there is no large-scale industrial waste as in other parts of the Nation. Washington is located at the point where tide-water from Chesapeake Bay meets fresh water from the mountains. From Three Sisters Island above Key Bridge down to the bay, the Potomac is tidal. In the summer and fall when the flow of fresh water is low, the river behaves more like a lake. The water moves upstream and downstream with the tides and wind and circles between its banks. During the low summer flows a drop of water takes 40 days to travel from Three Sisters Island to Fort Washington, a distance of only 15 miles. Thus it can be readily understood that the Potomac in the summer and fall is not like an ordinary fresh water stream. The sewage entering from Washington, Arlington, and Alexandria is not carried away downstream. It stays right here and that is our problem today.

I do not wish to minimize in any way the work that has been accomplished up to this time to control and abate pollution in this metropolitan area. Much has been done with the limited funds available toward development of construction plans for waste treatment works. The various jurisdictions have completed the greater part of the primary treatment works and are proceeding with plans and extensive construction designed for secondary treatment and interceptor works. It is appropriate to mention briefly some of the important projects:

Construction in the District of Columbia of the secondary sewage treatment facilities at Blue Plains is scheduled for completion in 1959. This plant which is to treat both District of Columbia and Washington Suburban Sanitary District sewage will, on completion, provide 80 to 85 percent treatment. Further, extensive corrective work is under way or proposed to eliminate dry weather overflows and reduce frequency of wet weather discharges into the river from the combined sewer system.

In Arlington County, a primary sewage treatment plant is in operation but can only perform a partial job of treatment. Under the present program, it is estimated that the construction of secondary sewage treatment facilities may not be completed before 1970, the starting date of construction to be determined



primarily by river conditions subsequent to the District's plant additions. Remedial measures are now under construction to eliminate certain raw sewage discharges from the Rosslyn area and to remove Alexandria sewage from Four Mile Run in Arlington County.

Fairfax County is well under way in an extensive sewer construction program designed to remove the untreated overflows from septic tanks from the natural waters of the county. Further, several primary or secondary treatment plants are in operation or planned to provide essential pollution abatement needs.

Alexandria now has under construction much needed interceptors as well as a secondary sewage treatment plant being jointly financed with Fairfax County.

In the Maryland area construction is under way to deliver all Anacostia Valley sewage to the District system for treatment at Blue Plains. Partial but inadequate treatment is provided for Rockville and Gaithersburg sewage. In several locations in Maryland counties, subdivisions are without sewage disposal facilities; however, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission is undertaking extensive trunkline construction to serve such areas.

The above represents the briefest thumbnail sketch of the work under construction and programed in the metropolitan area. The value of major construction work done from 1950 to 1955 by the above-mentioned jurisdictions to abate pollution amounts to roughly \$20 million. It has been estimated that \$28 million to \$30 million will be expended by these jurisdictions by 1960 on current pollution abatement programs.

Upon completion of the programed work now scheduled through 1960 there should be no dry weather discharges of raw sewage to the Potomac and except for Arlington, two proposed small Fairfax company plants and Fort Belvoir, all sewage discharges to the river will have received from 60 to 80 percent treatment. This is far from ideal but it shows the intensive efforts made by the local jurisdictions to improve a nearly intolerable situation and means that the backlog of acute requirements for pollution control facilities resulting from recent population expansion will be largely satisfied by these programs.

I wish to emphasize that a good job of engineering and programing has been accomplished but in a piecemeal or inadequately related fashion. The plans have not been adequately coordinated and a comprehensive metropolitan area-wide plan must be developed if maximum benefit is to be obtained from the corrective programs of local jurisdictions.

I am told that the population of the Washington metropolitan area is now approximately 1,800,000. Competent authorities have estimated the population 25 years hence to be between 3,500,000 and 5 million. If this occurs, over twice as many people will be using area water and discharging wastes into area streams than do so today. I am also advised that a good part of this expansion has been

anticipated at least in a general way in the programed work.

It is now apparent, however, that growth greater than considered in past studies may be expected as the central part of the area reaches saturation. For example, it is understood that a dozen or so agencies situated within the District of Columbia now have under consideration the possibility of relocating their activities to points elsewhere in the metropolitan area. Since adequate sites are scarce it is probable that the agencies when relocating will look to the generally undeveloped portions of the area.

This trend is illustrated by the selection of a site near Germantown, Md., by the Atomic Energy Commission and near Langley, Va., by the Central Intelligence Agency. Further, it is normal that new subdivisions and satellite communities develop near such installations. These all generate sewage and add to the complexity of the pollution abatement plans. The important conclusion is that the aggregate effect of such new developments, in spite of individual sewage treatment, can undermine or vitiate the beneficial effect to be expected from much of the remedial construction now planned or recently completed elsewhere in the metropolitan area.

The effect of decentralization coupled with the continued rapid growth of the area has caused greatest concern as it relates to future water supplies. There is of course a direct relationship between pollution and use of water for domestic purposes because the Potomac River and tributaries serve as the chief source of supply. I will not take time to cite detailed figures on increased use of water. I understand that because of population growth the deadline for greatly increased water supply in the area, originally envisioned for the year 2000, has of necessity been moved up to 1970. Per capita consumption, which has more than doubled in 50 years, will continue to increase. But one of the largest potential uses for water, the possibilities of which are just now being recognized, is that of supplemental irrigation. Unlike water for domestic or industrial use, a relatively small portion of water used for irrigation is returned to the stream. Furthermore, peak irrigation demands are concurrent with other maximum demands for water in drought periods.

The lowest flow of record in the Potomac, 506 million gallons per day at Great Falls, occurred during the summer of 1930. Normal maximum day requirements for the Washington water system, including Arlington County and Falls Church, are estimated to be 334 million gallons per day in 1985 with a potential national emergency requirement of 418 million gallons per day. Adding potential requirements of 43 million gallons per day for Fairfax County and up to 60 million gallons per day for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission other than the Patuxent system, it can be foreseen that the water requirements for the Washington metropolitan area will equal or exceed the minimum natural flow in the next 30 to 35 years.

Increased irrigation usage, on top of the above-mentioned increased requirements during low flow periods when the degrading effect of pollution is most acute, could lead to a serious water shortage at a much earlier date than has heretofore been generally recognized. It is important to mention, therefore, that in the preparation of a comprehensive plan most careful attention must be given to the Washington area pollution and water supply problem in relation to other uses of Potomac River water currently under consideration by the Army engineers.

All of my remarks above bear on the need for a comprehensive areawide plan for pollution control. Under H. R. 8108, the bill I proposed, Federal financial assistance in the amount of \$250,000 to the Interstate Commission is authorized for the preparation of a comprehensive master water pollution control plan and \$50,000 to reimburse States and their political subdivisions for expenses incurred by them in obtaining information for the study. Under such a plan all future construction needs of the various jurisdictions and the time schedule for such construction could be developed.

Why provide Federal financial help for preparation of a master plan? There are several reasons. Because Washington is the Nation's Capital, there has been a tremendous growth in the surrounding areas as well as in the District of Columbia. Because of this, the pollution problem in the Washington metropolitan area can be considered unique in that the Federal establishment is both a major economic factor in the area as well as a large contributor to the problem. Further, Federal agencies occupy large areas within local jurisdictions which have high potential tax values but pay no taxes. This limits the ability of these jurisdictions to finance local improvements.

As proposed in H. R. 8108, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin appears to be the logical agency for coordinating the development and implementation of a pollution abatement and control plan for the metropolitan area. It has ample authority under the provisions of its interstate compact to work directly with the local jurisdictions and to employ or otherwise obtain whatever administrative or technical consultation or assistance is needed. It is envisioned that the Interstate Commission would work closely with the National Capital Regional Planning Council in order that a master plan would be fully coordinated with the information and plans of the council. Information relating to future population growth, land uses, densities of occupancy and distributions of Federal establishments within the area would be secured from appropriate agencies directly concerned with the problems.

In addition to authorizing Federal financial assistance for planning, H. R. 8108 also authorizes the Surgeon General, subject to certain limitations, to make grants to the States and their political subdivisions, during the Interstate Commission's study, of up to \$10 million for construction of waste treatment works.

I consider this a most important item as it would provide for an accelerated program at the Nation's Capital. In many respects this is a showplace for the world and certainly sets a pattern for action in other parts of the country.

If I may digress a moment, I wish to emphasize that every year hundreds of thousands of visitors come to Washington from all over the Nation and all corners of the earth. They find magnificent buildings, beautiful trees, miles of parkland. In contrast they also find an unclean Potomac. Whether they are picnickers, strollers or motorists close to the Potomac's banks, are fishing from the banks or are on the river in boats, they all can attest to the foulness of the water, a condition which measurably detracts from the pleasures normally associated with a clean fresh water stream.

It is the intent that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service administer the construction grant provisions of the bill. Provision in the bill for Commission approval would appear to provide assurance that works constructed under the grant provision would be compatible with the Commission's overall plan.

Considering the rapidly rising debt of all communities in the metropolitan area, much of which has been assumed for their current local abatement programs it is probable that future progress will depend on their ability to go further in debt as their credit approaches exhaustion or obtain some financial assistance from the Federal Government.

In this connection it is pertinent to mention that Federal responsibility for the Federal impact on other communities has been recognized in various enactments of Congress which have made available Federal funds for the construction of expanded public improvements.

In conclusion, may I emphasize the need for foresight by all concerned in providing authorization for financing both an areawide master plan for pollution control as a local-interstate-Federal cooperative effort and Federal construction grants for restricted use by the Public Health Service pending completion of this plan.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the chairman of the committee handling this bill, has promised me separate hearings and consideration of my bill, H. R. 8108. However, due to the lateness of the session and due to the fact that the bill we are considering today, H. R. 9540, covers in broader terms most of the provisions of my bill, I would like to urge its passage and urge the Surgeon General of the United States and the Commission on the Potomac River Basin to exercise the provisions of the bill and let us start a program which will result in a cleaner and safer Potomac.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHLI] has expired.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, year after year the Congress appropriates millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money for the purpose of raising the living standards and improving the health standards of people in dozens of countries abroad. I think we certainly owe it to ourselves and to our future generations to provide the machinery and to authorize the appropriation of adequate moneys to meet this serious problem within our own country.

The bill under consideration, H. R. 9540, represents a real forward step in advancing the health and economic well-being of every community in our Nation. The committee is to be commended in the amendments it has recommended in extending and strengthening the Water Pollution Act of 1948, which authorizes the Public Health Service, under the supervision and direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to carry on cooperative programs with the State and interstate water pollution control agencies. I am in favor of the purposes of the bill and wish to express my wholehearted support of the provisions to provide financial and technical assistance to our States in the prevention and control of water pollution.

Federal assistance to the States for this purpose is a proper function in carrying out our constitutional obligation to provide for the general welfare of our Nation. In this regard, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its report to the Congress and the President in June 1955, in discussing the pollution problem, stated, in part:

The Commission recommends that States vigorously enforce existing water pollution abatement laws and that they expand and improve their legislation in this field. The Commission also recommends that, as a stimulus to further action, the National Government provide technical and financial assistance to State and interstate pollution-control agencies. The Commission further recommends that study be given to the desirability of Federal financial assistance, for a limited time, to cooperative programs for the construction of pollution abatement facilities.

This is also an interstate problem, since in many cases our States are powerless to act due to the very interstate nature of water pollution. Take the Ohio, for example. It affects not only my State of West Virginia, but Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, and Kentucky, as well.

It has been estimated that by 1975 our public water use will increase from 17 to 30 billion gallons per day, and industrial use, excluding power, will increase from 60 to 115 billion gallons per day. This added use will result in increased pollution that not only presents a serious public health problem but also decreases the amount of available usable water.

Many communities find it impossible to divert their limited funds to the construction of sewage facilities in the face of other local needs, such as increased educational facilities. It is also recognized that our municipalities are limited in their tax rates, their bonded indebtedness, and their expenditures. The State governments, for the most part,

are not in a position to lend the necessary financial assistance, and for this reason we have the duty and responsibility to render such aid as is necessary—at the same time being mindful of the congressional policy to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary rights and responsibilities of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution.

Of utmost importance are the provisions in section 6 of the bill, which authorize the appropriation of \$50 million per year over a 10-year period as grants to States, municipalities, intermunicipal, and interstate agencies for preliminary planning and construction of treatment works. Grants are limited to 33 1/3 percent of the estimated reasonable cost of the construction or \$300,000, whichever is the smaller. Moreover, section 6 provides that at least 50 percent of the funds so authorized must be allocated to municipalities of 125,000 population or under, and this is certainly a worthy feature which will enable communities to undertake the necessary planning and construction of sewage systems.

The fact that such provisions were not a part of the original Water Pollution Control Act is not relevant to the argument that has been made against their inclusion in this bill, on the ground that this is a major new undertaking and there has been no demonstration of need nor any widespread requirement for Federal assistance in financing the construction of sewage-treatment facilities. Actually, the bill reflects the experience of the Public Health Service during the past seven years in administering the Water Pollution Control Act.

Since the Congress originally acted in this matter, more than half the States have improved their legislation and strengthened their pollution-control programs.

West Virginia is a member of the Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission, which is a compact of eight States devoted to the abatement of pollution in the Ohio Basin, the Ohio River, and its tributaries. The West Virginia Water Commission, as an agency of the Ohio Valley Commission, has ordered our State municipalities to put into effect measures to accomplish water-pollution control in the interest of our public health. Some of our municipalities, like those of other States, are powerless to act until financial assistance is made available to them. Through the means of the legislation here under consideration, we have the opportunity to encourage and strengthen local programs of pollution control.

Unfortunately, the present bill is not as generous as we might wish; however, there is no question but that Federal assistance measures in the bill will spearhead our local communities in their efforts to carry out much needed programs. Certainly, if we can authorize the appropriation of billions of dollars for foreign-aid programs, it should be possible to benefit our own people.

I therefore recommend, Mr. Chairman, that the bill be passed.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].



Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I was indeed happy to see the House pass H. R. 9540, the antipollution bill. As a Member of the House Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, it was my privilege to play a small part in assisting our able chairman, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, with this bill in the committee and its final passage on the floor.

The need for accelerated action to abate the pollution of streams is long over due. I would like to quote from a speech made on May 4, 1956, in Cincinnati, Ohio, by the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Roswell B. Perkins. He had this to say about the water-pollution problem:

Water pollution is the end result of a great variety of factors which by themselves attract only local and passing attention. The difficulty is that no bells ring and no lights flash to warn the people of a community that the danger point has been reached.

A new factory here, a new housing development there, a new office building somewhere—these are the symbols of our national growth and prosperity, the symbols of 20th century progress. Multiplied all up and down a river system, they are also symbols—to the sanitary engineer—of water supply and water pollution control problems. But in the clamor and clang of a busy and prosperous world, with its endless competing demands for people's attention, the warning voice of the sanitary engineer and those of his associates in the health department are not always heard. And even when public interest is aroused, needed help for constructive action is frequently a long time materializing.

I think Mr. Perkins' statement is very forthright and I am only fearful that the \$50 million per year authorization for grants in this bill for sewage disposal treatment plants will not be adequate to take care of the situation. I have many municipalities in my congressional district that are in need of sewage treatment facilities, but due to their limited bonding powers are unable to construct these facilities on their own. One city, Murphysboro, Ill., a fine community of approximately 8,000 people, has been ordered by the courts to build a sewage treatment plant and would be willing, but is financially unable. Legislation such as this will be of material benefit to those communities, which for economic and other reasons are not financially able to comply with abatement orders.

I am hopeful that the amount of money authorized in the bill will be allowed by the Appropriations Committee each year to carry out this very important program, and that the Congress will insist that it be pushed as expeditiously as possible.

I deeply appreciate the time and effort expended by all of the members of the House Committee on Public Works for their diligent and untiring efforts in working out a solution to this complicated problem. I particularly want to congratulate the author of the bill, the

Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, for doing an outstanding job.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to unqualifiedly endorse the legislation proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], and that includes section 6. Some time ago I received an invitation from my State petroleum association to address them. The supposition on their part was that I would talk about the conservation of natural gas and oil. Much to their surprise, when I arrived to address them, I had a prepared address under the caption "Water. The White Gold of the Future."

The Nation is awake to the necessity for conserving and taking care of our supply of water. It is more valuable than a lot of our other resources. I ask you what value is that to the citizens if it is given to them polluted? Here is an opportunity to do something toward clearing up the pollution of our Nation's inland bodies of water, in which the Government is particularly interested, in that they control all navigable streams. I cannot conceive of an organized effort to take from this legislation the very heart of it. I am going to say to my colleagues on the left, who are showing some semblance of an organized effort to strike section 6 out of this legislation, that if you do it you are going to do it over the protests and recommendations of over 12,000 municipalities in the United States, and I propose to read them into the Record.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, it is very gratifying to see the Congress take steps to amend its laws with respect to water pollution, so that the country may adequately start to do the job of cleaning the water of this Nation.

I have been working for the last year with the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, in an effort to get that Commission to do more than it has been doing with respect to pollution in the Potomac River Basin. That Commission was created back in 1938, pursuant to a resolution of this Congress. Unfortunately, pursuant to that resolution, that Commission took upon itself only the power to recommend and plan. I have been suggesting for some time that that Commission should take upon itself the power to control and regulate pollution and water conservation in the Potomac River Basin. For some reason the Commission has been a bit hesitant. There may have been some doubt as to whether or not they had the power to amend the compact under which they are operating in order to take on the greater powers suggested. So I am happy to get the reply from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota, in answer to the question I directed to him a moment ago that, in his opinion, under section 3 (b) of this act, a commission already estab-

lished under interstate compact could properly amend such a compact to include any broader powers it might need properly to take care of the pollution of streams over which it had jurisdiction. So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin pays some heed to the words that have been said on the floor here today and not any longer be timid about increasing its authority, so that it may properly control and regulate pollution in the Potomac River Basin.

I am sorry to be in some disagreement with certain of my colleagues on section 6 of the bill. The Federal Government has jurisdiction over navigable streams and waters of the United States. That jurisdiction is recognized in the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me that pure water is as important as dams; clean water is just as important as controlling the flow of that water; I might say more so.

One of the great deterrents to many small communities to the construction of sewage-treatment plants is the tremendous cost of such plants. This seems to me to be a proper field for Federal assistance. I want to urge the support of this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, borrowing the expression we have heard a number of times from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]: "If section 6 was deleted" reminds me of the story of the fellow out fishing who had a wiggling catfish in his hand and said to the fish: "Hold still, fish; I ain't going to hurt you, I'm just gwine to gut you, that's all."

Look at these figures: Over here \$172 million being spent; here, \$450 million shown as needed. Each year we fall behind, year by year, when water is the most important thing in the country for industry and its cities.

Much is made of the point that Federal assistance in the construction of local sewage works would penalize the cities and towns that have already put out money for the construction of such plants.

By the same reasoning, the Federal Government should not assist in the construction of hospitals because some cities have already built hospitals.

The Federal Government assists in the construction of hospitals for the simple reason that the health of the American people is important not only to the individual citizen but to the whole country.

The same thing holds true with respect to the Nation's water resources.

Every civilization in history that has risen to a position of eminence has done so on an abundance of water and land resources.

That is true of the United States of America.

Today, the water resources of the Nation are in jeopardy. Some of the finest streams in America have been all but destroyed by sewage and industrial wastes.

It is not enough to say that this is a State and local responsibility. It is a national responsibility.

## INDUSTRIAL FOCUS

The House of Representatives has before it a bill for extending and strengthening the Water Pollution Control Act. This bill would continue the authority of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, to provide Federal technical services to State and interstate agencies and to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial waste, or other substance which may adversely affect such waters.

The basic public laws of the Federal Government authorize the Surgeon General to conduct similar activities relating to the causes of diseases and impairments of man, but not relating to the conservation of surface and underground waters for the propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. Consequently, the Federal Government will lack authority after June 30, 1956, for water-pollution control other than for human consumption.

Although the quality of water for human consumption is our first concern, we cannot afford to neglect other uses of water which have a profound effect on our standard of living. The value of water-pollution control is measured not only in terms of important benefits accruing to the public health and well-being of the Nation, but in the more direct benefits related to water supplies for domestic and industrial purposes.

In all parts of the Nation today, waste discharges to streams by municipalities and industries have exceeded the abilities of many water bodies for assimilation and self-purification. Further impairment of water quality is undesirable, and this, in effect, places a ceiling on industrial development in these areas—regardless of whether the location may be advantageous from other standpoints. Certain industries have already adopted the policy of not permitting the construction of new manufacturing units until the wastes already produced could be properly handled without abusing the river receiving the wastes. Hence the economic advantage made available in many cases through plant expansion rather than by locating new facilities in other areas cannot be realized. While applicable to large industry, this is especially true for small industries where split location of facilities would increase costs to such an extent that increase in production would not be profitable.

The development of the highly industrialized sections of the North Atlantic States has been in part due to the availability of adequate volumes of water for industrial purposes. The industrial demands on water supply have in recent years become so great that future expansion may be limited unless adequate supplies can be provided and existing supplies protected from damaging pollution.

It is interesting to note that the weight of water used by industry is 50 times the weight of all other raw materials combined. In order to produce one ton of steel, 65,000 gallons of water are used in

many mills. Over 31 gallons of water are needed to process one gallon of aviation gasoline. The processing of 100 pounds of hides for leather requires 650 gallons of water. It takes 180 gallons to produce a pound of rayon yarn, 510 gallons for 1 yard of woolen cloth.

The problem of supplying increasing amounts of water of satisfactory quality for industry is complicated by more and more complex types of waste compounds. Although industry is doing remarkable research in some areas, a great deal remains to be done in discovering ways to treat new types of waste and in reducing the cost of treatment methods already developed.

The Public Health Service under the legislation under consideration can add considerably to the much-needed research work. It can intensify and broaden its research program into the important phases of control of pollution caused by industrial waste whether injurious to health or not. The proposed law would permit the Public Health Service to bring to bear on the overall pollution problem available but either untapped or uncoordinated research potentials outside the Federal Government.

Among the new phases of research that can be carried out under the bill under consideration are the following:

First. Research and demonstrations into all phases of water resources development, conservation, and reclamation such as reservoir evaporation control; underground water storage; recharge of ground-water reservoirs; and prevention of salt-water intrusion along coastal areas.

Second. Research into the practicability of closed municipal water systems wherein water would be continuously recirculated after treatment to remove suspended and dissolved solids introduced by use. The only new water needed would be that required to make up losses during use. Such closed water systems may prove to be the answer to water-shortage problems, particularly in arid and semiarid regions.

Third. Develop and apply techniques and procedures for evaluating the beneficial effects of pollution control on the total economy of an area or region as a research demonstration project; also to determine monetary values for tangible and intangible benefits from pollution control.

I believe that our well-being, as will be reflected by the industrial future of the Nation, can be assured only by adequate water-pollution control. I believe the Federal Government can contribute to this industrial future if it has laws authorizing it to do so. I believe that the water-pollution control measure before this body will permit such Federal action. Therefore, I will vote for it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate with a great deal of interest, and I congratulate all the previous speakers in submitting to the committee the facts as they see them.

The real reason for this particular legislation is that the existing law expires on June 30 of this year. The existing law, as you know, was enacted by the 80th Congress and we did carry certain allocations of funds in that law.

I would like to call your attention to what the existing law is and what would happen if we strike out section 6. Under existing law the communities got up to \$1 million for each of the fiscal years from 1948 to 1956 for preliminary action relative to a construction program. Some of the previous speakers would lead you to believe that if we strike out section 6 you would have nothing left. The bill that has been introduced and passed by the Senate was approximately the same as existing law—S. 890.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. For a question.

Mr. BAILEY. Let us keep in mind the fact there was no money made available.

Mr. McGREGOR. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. BAILEY. Let the gentleman provide us then with figures showing there were appropriations made to implement the plan he is taking credit for adopting.

Mr. McGREGOR. We are not taking credit for adopting anything. The 80th Congress passed the existing law and fish pollution bill. There were \$22.5 million for loans and that money was available if a community wanted to borrow from the Federal Government.

What does section 6 do? Does it lend? Section 6 says that the Federal Government shall give to political subdivisions up to \$500 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has a greater indebtedness than all of the municipalities and all of the States in this entire Nation; yet some of my distinguished friends are saying: Let the Federal Government give us an additional \$500 million.

The question has been brought up of just what will happen to some of those political subdivisions. I think the State of my distinguished friend from West Virginia has gone a long way in correcting some of the pollution problems of that State, the same as the great State of Ohio.

What are we doing to those political subdivisions that have gone ahead, that have taken the initiative, that have obeyed the law and that have even taxed their own local people? We are saying to them: It is just too bad, you obeyed the law too soon. Had you waited a few more years, Congress would have given you the entire cost of your project.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am interested in the point the gentleman is making at the present time. Did the committee consider making this retroactive?

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes; the committee did consider a retroactive clause because some of us felt it is unfair to penalize a community that takes the initiative and follows the law passed by the Congress and took advantage, some of



them did, of the \$22,500,000 by borrowing. In addition to that, we had \$1 million a year in grants for planning.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. If we were to make this retroactive, it would take a whole lot more than the \$50 million to pay up the back amounts we owe?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think it would. The gentleman from Cincinnati has stated on the floor that it has cost more than \$50 million for the city of Cincinnati alone. Yet you are going to penalize the city of Cincinnati and many of the political subdivisions of your districts because they have bonded the people, they have put a tax on the local people, because they recognized, and I repeat, that there is more indebtedness by the Federal Government than all the cities, all the political subdivisions and all of the States of this Union. And yet you are going to say, "Give us more money."

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I was a city official in a city that was involved in the building of a sewage-disposal plant prior to my coming to Congress. We issued \$6 million worth of bonds. Now, if I understand this bill correctly, the maximum we could have gotten from the Federal Government in behalf of that construction would be \$300,000, which is actually only 5 percent of the \$6 million bond issue.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the reason I said in my opening remarks that the figures in this bill are unrealistic. No \$500 million is going to do this job. You ought to make it \$7 billion so that you know what you are committing the Federal Government to.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is the situation. And may I call to the attention of the Members who are members of a State or political subdivision, who have paid for your own sanitary systems, you are going to have to pay for somebody else's sanitary system. This \$500 million does not grow on trees. You are going to have to tax somebody to pay for it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the gentleman if the city of Zanesville, which has recently voted a bond issue for a sewage system, would be able to participate in this program?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Not at all, because there is no retroactive provision in this bill. I understand there is going to be an amendment offered to make it retroactive. If you do not care where the money is coming from and just want to spend it, certainly it is a fair proposition to make it retroactive.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Under section 7 there is provided a water pollution control advisory board. Under section 6 the Surgeon General of the United States is given tremendous power to locate these projects. Now, the question I want to ask is this: Does the control board have overriding authority over the Surgeon General?

Mr. MCGREGOR. The man who tells you you are going to get the money is the Surgeon General.

Mr. GROSS. One man?

Mr. MCGREGOR. He has the authority to make the decision. The board can make a recommendation, but the Surgeon General is the man responsible and he is going to tell you whether or not your political subdivision, your sanitation or pollution control program is in accord with his views. He does not have to follow the commission's report.

Mr. GROSS. To whom would you appeal if you felt you did not get the right treatment?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do not know, because you are giving somebody authority to spend it all.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. On the point of \$500 million being unrealistic, the gentleman from Ohio is absolutely correct. Our original proposal was for \$100 million a year to take care of not a backlog but just to take up and catch up at the rate we are falling behind, which is estimated at \$2 billion, on a 50-50 matching basis.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am sorry. I cannot yield to my chairman for a speech. I want to say in closing if this bill is passed, the entire stream pollution program, in my opinion, will automatically halt, because they will say "Congress has passed a Federal law. Why should we spend our own money?" Then they will say to the next Congress, "This crowd gave us \$50 million. Now you give us \$100 million." And you will be taking the control away from your locality, your State people, Mr. Chairman, when you are putting it in the hands of the Surgeon General of the United States, who will tell you what to do.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman mentioned this figure of \$500 million being unrealistic. Will the gentleman participate with me in an amendment to raise the amount which could be granted to any single municipality to, say, \$500,000 or \$1 million?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Indeed I will not, because I realize our debt is so high now, our taxes are so high, and certainly we are not in debt near as much now as we would be if we had to raise this additional money. The cities, as I said before, have more money than we have, so why should we give them more? We are all in favor of the bill with the exception of section 6. Because we realize that section 6 will cost many millions of dollars

and will have a tremendous bearing on our ability to balance the budget and reduce taxes.

The present water pollution control law—Public Law 845, 80th Congress—expires June 30, 1956. Enactment of new legislation at this session of Congress is required to continue the Federal-State cooperative program. The problem of stream pollution is becoming more serious.

The President in his state of the Union and health messages in 1955 and 1956 urged enactment of legislation to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. The administration bill—S. 890—passed the Senate in 1955 in modified form. In general, H. R. 9540 incorporates the principles of S. 890 with minor modifications recommended by the States. However, H. R. 9540 includes a new provision—section 6—added by the House Committee on Public Works, authorizing Federal grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works.

The administration strongly endorses H. R. 9540 except for section 6. Authority for construction grants is not considered necessary nor desirable.

#### PRINCIPLES OF H. R. 9540

H. R. 9540 would continue the basic principles of the present act—Public Law 845—namely, the primary responsibility for pollution control rests with the States, with the Federal role one of research, technical assistance, program grants to States, and collaboration on enforcement in interstate problems. Seven years experience with Public Law 845 indicated the desirability of the following modifications, which are incorporated in both S. 890 and H. R. 9540:

First. Broadened research, including research grants, fellowships, and contract research. This increased effort, enlisting the support of universities and other centers, is essential for developing the information basic to the entire program—section 4.

Second. Broadened program grants to States, on a matching basis, designed to strengthen all aspects of State pollution control programs—section 5.

Third. Simplified and more practicable enforcement procedure for control of interstate pollution—section 8.

This legislation would provide a sound basis for a concerted Federal-State effort to correct and control pollution. This collaborative effort, properly implemented, should help to curb the increasing seriousness of water pollution and avoid the need for a stronger Federal role in enforcement and for large Federal subsidies for construction.

#### CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDIES

While recognizing the importance of a great expansion in the construction of sewage treatment works, the administration opposes the inclusion of section 6 in H. R. 9540 for the reason set forth below:

#### POINTS AGAINST PROVIDING FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID FOR MUNICIPAL SEWAGE TREATMENT CONSTRUCTION (SEC. 6 OF H. R. 9540)

First. With minor exceptions, there is no evidence indicating financial inability of cities to construct necessary sewage treatment works. Even in the few

exceptions, actual financial inability to construct treatment works is predominantly a result of legal limitations or physical deficiencies rather than a true lack of financial resource.

Second. H. R. 9540 establishes the congressional policy that sewage treatment for pollution abatement is a responsibility of the States. The proposed legislation includes ample provisions to cover the Federal interest and Federal responsibility involved in pollution abatement without including Federal financial aid for construction (section 6). These provisions include program grants and technical assistance to the States, Federal aid for research, and a share of the responsibility to abate interstate pollution.

Third. The provision of Federal financial aid for construction in section 6 of H. R. 9540, even if implemented with appropriations, is likely to retard rather than stimulate construction. The \$50 million authorized would aid about 200 cities. Even at the present rate of construction, almost 300 cities per year build sewage treatment plants.

Fourth. Federal subsidy for construction of municipal sewage treatment constitutes a type of class legislation and would encourage many other special interests to flock to Congress for similar type of aid.

Fifth. It is unrealistic to assume that Federal assistance will end with the \$500 million total authorization in H. R. 9540. Once initiated, Federal subsidies would be required on a continuing basis to meet new problems and to take care of obsolescence.

Sixth. Most cities are authorized to finance the cost of sewage treatment on a revenue bond basis, with charges apportioned on the basis of water use. This places the cost where it should be—on those using the system and causing the problem.

Seventh. In 1955 there were 280 municipal sewage treatment plants constructed. Even though this rate of construction is insufficient to halt the growing pollution problem, had the \$50 million authorized been available in 1955, only two-thirds of these cities would have received assistance. The net result would have been delays in construction by the other third awaiting promised Federal aid.

Eighth. If water pollution abatement is primarily a State responsibility, as this bill says, the States should take the lead in helping cities financially to handle this problem. Not more than half a dozen of the wealthier States have ever taken that course. When the States have shown concern and acted, then there might be some justification for requesting Federal aid, if need is demonstrated.

Ninth. Bad pollution situations can be corrected by adequate enforcement of State laws. All of the States have the legislative power to abate pollution. Many of these chronic offenders who would profit by this financial assistance have been under orders and directions to clean up for some time. If the States and cities are not sufficiently interested to enforce their laws and spend their money to clean up, then why should the

Federal Government do it for them? Furthermore, there is a provision in this legislation whereby the Federal Government can, in collaboration with the States, take action on interstate pollution situations. What is needed is more vigorous action on the part of the States to enforce the laws already on the books rather than coming to Washington for a reward for State and local negligence.

Tenth. In 1954, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare called in a group of financial consultants to consider the advisability of recommending some form of Federal financial aid for construction in the new water pollution legislation. After meeting with the Department to explore this situation, these experts did not see fit to recommend that provision for such Federal assistance be included. When asked on the desirability of extending the construction loan provision in the present law, on balance these consultants advised it was not sufficiently important or useful to recommend the Department's requesting of Congress its continuation.

I hope we delete section 6 and then pass the bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, it is a known fact that \$100 million was in the bill and the opposite side cut it one-half by their amendment.

WE CANNOT HAVE EFFECTIVE POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS WITHOUT ADEQUATE ENFORCEMENT

Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has reported H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. Among the strengthening features of this bill is section 8 which provides enforcement measures against pollution of interstate waters.

This bill states categorically that it is the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution. In keeping with this policy, the purpose of section 8 is to protect interstate streams where the responsible States are either unwilling or unable to control water pollution that adversely affects the health or welfare of persons in another State.

In the Water Pollution Control Act currently in force the Federal Government must carry out certain procedures, once interstate pollution has become apparent. But the Federal Government cannot move to abate interstate pollution through court action without first obtaining the consent of the State in which the pollution is contributed to an interstate stream. Nowhere else in Anglo Saxon jurisprudence is it customary to obtain the consent of a culpable party before taking legal corrective action against an offense.

Not only is this veto provision unfair to governmental agencies but in the case of interstate pollution it does not recognize the rights of the States that are adversely affected by interstate pollution. I am glad to say that this bill as reported would rectify this anomaly by permitting court action on the part of the Federal

Government upon the request of the damaged State or with consent of the State responsible for the pollution. This degree of protection of States rights is a must. I believe the committee is to be congratulated on making this change.

The committee has also greatly improved the overall procedures which the Federal Government must follow in abating interstate pollution. These procedures are reasonable and, although somewhat time consuming, appear to be equitable among the various interested parties.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service would be required, either upon the request of a State or on the basis of information that interstate pollution is occurring, to give formal notification to all enforcement agencies within the area where the pollution is taking place. He would then be required to promptly call a conference of the water pollution control agencies of the interested States. A summary of the conference would be forwarded to those attending. If he saw fit, the Surgeon General could then recommend the necessary remedial action and allow at least 6 months for this to be taken.

If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution were not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could then hold a public hearing near where the pollution originated. This hearing would be held before a nonpartisan board which would determine whether or not pollution was occurring and whether progress was being made toward its abatement. It would then submit its recommendations for reasonable and equitable abatement measures to the Secretary. The Secretary would in turn send such findings and recommendations to the culpable parties specifying a reasonable time for securing abatement. The same information would also be sent to the State enforcement agencies in which the pollution arises. Further action would be taken through Federal court if compliance with the Secretary's request was still not forthcoming.

I believe that section 8 of this bill has enough teeth in it to bring about the restoration of our water resources. This section, of course, is coupled with other provisions of the bill which make Federal financial and technical assistance available for developing water pollution control methods and constructing facilities.

The current Water Pollution Control Act will expire on June 30. I hope that the House of Representatives will act favorably on this bill and that immediate concurrence can be obtained from the Senate so that a hiatus in Federal water pollution control will not occur.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, of our natural resources, water has become the



No. 1 concern of the Nation. In testimony presented before our committee, it was brought out that during the past year more than 1,000 cities experienced domestic water shortages, and that an estimated 14 million Americans live in water-shortage areas. In most of these areas pollution is a large factor in the amount of usable water available. Many industries are finding it increasingly difficult to secure suitable water to maintain production. This is a national problem and clearly a responsibility of the Federal Government which must be met.

As acting chairman, I was most happy when the full Public Works Committee reported favorably H. R. 9540, the Blatnik bill, to extend and strengthen the expiring Federal water-pollution control law. There was overwhelming committee support for the measure. Even the section authorizing grants to municipalities for construction of sewage-treatment plants, which I wholeheartedly supported, was approved by a substantial majority. It is my earnest hope this section will be retained in the bill by the House today. In this connection, it is significant to point out that the only time that construction of sewage-treatment facilities has kept pace with increased pollution was in the period from 1933-39. This was the period when Federal financial assistance was available to municipalities for the construction of sewage-treatment plants.

I spent a large number of days in committee listening to voluminous testimony in support of this bill, all of which indicated plainly that each year we are going backward instead of forward in our fight against pollution. There is no doubt but that water-conservation policies are in the interest of the immediate and long-range needs of our Nation. In my opinion, the enactment of H. R. 9540 by the House today is the answer to this problem. The provisions contained in this bill will enable us to deal sensibly with water-conservation policies. I earnestly urge favorable action by the House on this very vital legislation.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my remarks today by a sincere tribute to the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. The bill before this Congress today, H. R. 9540, is a monument to his patience, perseverance, and hard work, and I say that when this bill becomes law, it will be due to the wonderful work which my good friend JOHN BLATNIK has done.

I want to also compliment the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee and the whole Public Works Committee for a splendid job of work, well done, in bringing out this bill.

This bill is a good bill, it deserves to be passed, and will do much to clean up an intolerable condition. Our committee took over 400 pages of testimony from people representing all forms of organizations in all phases of activity, and it is significant to note that there was not one person who denied the need for a

sound and vigorous pollution-control program.

I need not remind my colleagues that this problem of pollution will continue to grow as our population grows until and unless something be done. All of our streams and waters will be nothing but open running sores, full of contagion and filth, contributing to the disease and misfortune of our people, instead of the pure sparkling waters which our forefathers found in this country when they first arrived. Indeed that sad condition is well on its way to being a reality today.

The situation is such that U. S. News & World Report devoted a whole section of its April 27, 1956, issue to a discussion "Will water become scarce?" Its conclusion, I am sad to say, is not that it will or may become scarce, but rather that water is short now, will be shorter in the future, and that if something is not done now, and I quote from the magazine, "then 20 or 25 years from now it may be too late."

What does U. S. News & World Report say must be done? It sets forth the following program, storage, conservation, cleaning up and abatement of pollution, and possibly even purification of sea water.

Listen to these figures. In 1900 America used 40 billion gallons of water per day. In 1955 the use jumped to 262 billion gallons of water a day, and by 1975 the water need will be 453 billion gallons of water a day.

My dad used to say that there are three things which man must have over and above food and shelter to live. They are pure air, pure water, and sunlight. We had all of these things before we began to have industry, and we lived. We can continue to have these things if we are wise enough to have a forceful law to compel the cleaning up of our waters and air to permit us to again enjoy pure water and air. The cost of this in the case of industrial pollution will be a legitimate business expense which can be passed on to the consumers.

In the last 55 years daily water use has increased by 222 billion gallons; in the next 20 years America's water use will rise by 191 billion gallons. To quote U. S. News & World Report:

United States will need to drill deeper wells, clean up its rivers, and use their waters more efficiently, maybe refine sea water—or face increasing water shortages.

The sad fact is that there is not enough water for America's needs, and the wasteful use of this priceless resource must stop. While water use grows, the supply of this priceless resource remains static or even diminishes.

I need not prove to the membership of this House how foul many of our once pure waters have become. But some facts are both obvious and frightening. Today with flood comes both danger of drowning and disease. When our rivers overflow typhoid danger zooms to astronomical heights. The damage of other diseases skyrockets. Floods are often followed by outbreak of disease and even by epidemics in this enlightened country. It is a tribute to our medical profession that the outbreaks do not become more frequent or severe following floods.

Many of us will be interested to note the parallel between the increase of pollution and the incidence of polio in our own country. At the founding of our country polio was unknown, and until the time that human waste and industrial pollution began to pour into our rivers in large amounts this disease did not become prevalent. It first came to be found with any frequency in the 1870's and 1880's when pollution of our rivers began to be an important factor. By the 1920's it began to be epidemic. Today, when the pollution situation has become serious, it is a common occurrence, and I need not mention the condition of our streams. A similar parallel, identical in effect, but at different times, chronologically, occurs in other countries, among them Argentina and Russia. The time difference is caused by later development of sewage systems and later industrialization.

We are, for example, within the city of Washington, D. C., giving our sewage only 15 percent treatment during dry times. During times when storms increase the flow through the sewers the Potomac receives raw sewage which is a flow too heavy for treatment from the District's sewers.

In the course of a year Washington dumps an amount of raw sewage into the Potomac in amount of billions of gallons. The amount of sewage if in the form of a cube would be higher than the Washington Monument, and longer on each side than that edifice is high. The Potomac River at our own door step is a national disgrace. It smells foul at night, and cannot be used with safety for recreational purposes.

As great a project as this bill sets up, it will not quite keep up with the amount of sewage, municipal and industrial, which will be dumped into our waters because of the anticipated growth of population, industry, and water use. In 1920, we deposited in our streams the equivalent of municipal sewage of 40 million people, and the industrial waste equivalent of 50 million people. Today we fill our streams with the industrial waste equivalent of 110 million people and the municipal waste equivalent of 55 million people.

This bill is better than the Senate bill 890 and the previous law for a number of reasons. One is that it provides for scholarships and fellowships which can be granted at the discretion of the Secretary.

This is not philanthropic, but rather is a cold-blooded provision to get good research and good men to work for far less than it would cost to have the same high quality research done by full-time salaried people. Incidental to this a number of badly needed sanitary engineers and high quality research people will be trained. I need not say that such a program as this will make great use of existing school and research facilities either without cost or at low or nominal cost. Such a program will offer use of some of the best teaching brains at no cost at all to the Government to cooperate with those receiving the fellowships.

I do not need to tell my colleagues that there is great need for research in this program with the rapid growth of indus-

try in the country. The fact of the matter is that this subject is still one of the relatively untouched frontiers of science.

The enforcement provision is strengthened so that abatement proceedings can be instituted without the consent of the State wherein the pollution occurs. Parenthetically, I will say that the bill offers more than adequate safeguards to the rights of the State wherein the pollution occurs. In order to adequately protect this State, wherein the pollution occurs, a period of delays and safeguards is provided which provides that real abatement proceedings do not commence until better than 18 months after the first complaint. Those proceedings do not begin so long as substantial effort is being directed against this pollution within the State of origin. Nevertheless, this provision will be a huge step forward.

As many of my colleagues well know, the old enforcement provisions were so ineffectual that not one abatement proceeding was instituted during the life of the old law which expires this year.

I think it is particularly significant that the Appropriations Committee of this House denied a request for \$145,000 for enforcement of the old law on the grounds that the provision was simply unenforceable. As such it would be a waste of money to try to enforce that law. This law will be substantially better. It is not only an oversimplification, but a true statement to say that those who oppose this feature of the bill oppose the cleaning up of our rivers and streams. It is interesting to note that this particular feature of the bill is particularly unpalatable to those who are the worst and most unconscionable of the polluters.

The last feature which is a very significant advance over previous law is the feature providing for grants to States and municipalities. There are two such provisions in the bill.

Grants to States will be made on a matching funds basis for pollution abatement study and work. A sum of \$5 million per year is authorized for this feature.

A more important feature of this bill is the provision for grants to municipalities for construction of sewage treatment works and disposal works.

The sum authorized is \$50 million per year, for 10 years for a total of \$500 million. Grants will be limited to 33 1/3 percent of the cost of the work or \$300,000 whichever is smaller.

First of all, it is a simple fact that municipalities today cannot finance the improvements that they need. That statement holds true for cities the size of my own city of Detroit.

Secondly, municipalities are faced by legal, charter and constitutional limitations which prevent them from increasing their debt limit.

Also it is a fact that they face the simple economic facts of life, that a large number of municipal bonds and debentures are not marketable today; and for that reason they have a further difficulty in financing needed improvements, especially of the sort such as sewage treatment works with which we are dealing today in this bill.

I have heard many people say that this is not a realistic figure. I am going to tell you how realistic it is. First, it provides up to \$300,000 for any single project. If you figure that we finance an even number of projects at \$300,000, we can finance 166 or 167 projects a year, and over the 10-year period that is provided, we would be able to finance, or the municipalities would be able to finance, if you please, a total of 1666 or 1667 of these projects. If that will not help to clean up the streams of this country, I am sadly mistaken.

Let us go a step further. We have heard people say that it will induce municipalities not to go into this field until such time as appropriations are available for these grants. Maybe that is so, maybe it is not. The fact of the matter is that municipalities are not going into this field today. Something has got to be done.

I am going to stir this water in the exhibit for you. It is the polluted water that is going down the rivers today and that is the water that you and your people back home are going to be drinking. Perhaps you have financed some of these pollution control projects and perhaps you will be penalized a little bit for it by this bill. But remember this: You are going to get pure water for every cent you spend, and it is a good investment.

With the present state of municipal finance and the current high interest rate, construction of large capital improvements without such a provision is impossible for many of the municipalities.

Some people object to this on a number of grounds. But the fact of the matter is that such expenditures will buy pure water for us and for our children in days to come.

Construction of municipal sewage treatment and disposal works has not kept pace with the growth of the country and expansion of the population, except in one period, and that was during the days of the WPA and PWA, when very substantial grants were made by the Federal Government to help in this construction.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want merely to express my most sincere appreciation to the members of the subcommittee and the full committee on both sides for the excellent job that they have done. We have a record here of over 400 pages of printed hearings. We heard witnesses presenting all points of view. We feel we have covered the subject about as well as it has been covered to date.

We feel we have an excellent bill here. The only point of disagreement seems to be section 6, on grants in aid. I merely wanted to say that we have a well-rounded bill, for the first time, that will truly work. We have the broadest area of agreement among State organizations, State health agencies, conservation groups, Federal agencies and various geographical areas of the country that it is possible to have.

I strongly urge that H. R. 9540 be adopted by the House in its entirety, so it is not a dislocated or fractured bill which will only meet partially the mini-

mum objectives which we have outlined in our earlier presentation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this occasion to pay tribute to the conservation organizations that have worked long and diligently for enactment of this legislation. Indeed, this House would be remiss if the RECORD did not list, in recognition of their services, such great organizations as the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, the Sport Fishing Institute, the Wildlife Management Institute, the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, the National Parks Association, the Wilderness Society, the American Nature Association, the Outdoor Writers Association of America, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, and the Garden Club of America.

Along with these should be recognized the able and active conservation committees of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the League of Women Voters, and others. The ladies, God bless 'em, continue to be our most militant defenders of the public health. Always you find them exerting their charming and persuasive influence in behalf of the public welfare.

A glance at the contents of the published hearings on H. R. 9540 and S. 890 discloses the widespread and vigorous activity of the conservation groups in support of this legislation. If you listened to or read their statements, you realize their interest goes beyond the fish and wildlife and the recreational opportunities that are damaged or destroyed when human sewage or industrial wastes are allowed to flow untreated into our streams, lakes, and seashores.

Their testimony reveals a broad understanding of and concern for water-supply problems, the needs of industry and agriculture and of growing cities for clean water, the depressing effect of pollution on adjacent real-estate values, its menace to the public health, its destruction of many resource values, including natural beauty.

Mr. Chairman, the organized sportsmen of America, represented in various of the groups that I have named but notably by the big National Wildlife Federation with its State affiliates and the Izaak Walton League of America, have been in the forefront of the battle since the first stirrings of public conscience about the pollution of our public waters. The hunters and anglers have, I believe done more than any other group of citizens to bring about a cleanup. We find them active in support of pollution control and abatement measures in every State legislature. We find them crusading for bond issues when there is a sewage-treatment plant to be constructed. Certainly, we have felt the weight of their constructive influence during the considerations of this legislation.



Water pollution started in a small way, like soil erosion, and the first little gulches that marked the hillsides as a result of bad land use. It sort of sneaked up on us. No one paid any attention to it at first. But as it grew in volume and the streams became smelly, the fish started to die and the wild ducks flew away; the sportsmen were the first to take notice and to demand abatement. Let me quote from the words of Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, as he explained this phenomenon in testimony last year before the Senate subcommittee:

The hunters and fishermen of America have long been noted for their crusading and constructive interest in water-pollution abatement. More than any other segment of our citizenry, they have worked and fought for clean waters upon which the health and economic welfare of every citizen depends.

There are several good reasons why hunters and fishermen are so keenly interested in this problem. In the first place, the sportsman naturally tends to become a conservationist. He soon learns that his own sport depends upon fertile lands and clean waters.

Secondly, the sportsman gets out on the streams and lakes and along the shorelines more than the rest of the population. He gets out where he can see and smell the pollution.

Thirdly, the typical sportsman is especially endowed with the kind of energy and enterprise that make this Nation great. He isn't the kind to sit idly by and say nothing when there is a mess that needs cleaning up.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if many of us may not have a superficial mental picture of the hunters and anglers among us. Do we think of them merely as funny characters in hip boots or canvas britches, loaded down with paraphernalia and fighting off mosquitoes while trying to bait a hook in the middle of the stream? Or do we think of them huddling futilely in a duck blind during a freezing rain?

Let us take a look through the guns and tackle and under the outlandish garb and see who they really are. We will find among this army of outdoorsmen bankers and merchants, farmers and assembly-line workers. You will discover captains of industry and the janitors who sweep out their offices. You will find among them doctors and lawyers and editors and teachers. Your sportsman may be a policeman on his day off, or a white-collar worker who escapes on weekends to the woods and streams. If you happen to find your sportsman on a certain trout stream in Colorado or among the quail coverts of Georgia, he may even turn out to be the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, if you have wondered about the strength and influence of sportsmen when they get worked up about a problem like water pollution, the explanation lies both in their numbers and in the fact that their fraternity cuts a broad cross-section squarely across the population of America. Scratch any constituent and he is likely to be a sportsman.

I pay tribute to them and to all the other conservation-minded citizens of

this Nation. They are first-class citizens who campaign tirelessly for better management of our natural resources.

But let us not end merely with lip service to these the conservationists of America. The bill under consideration represents a major step forward in the national program to safeguard and conserve the vital water resources of the Nation. This then is a historic occasion. Let us grasp it with an outpouring of affirmative votes for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466j) is hereby amended to read as follows:

#### "DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. (a) In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the prevention and control of water pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall administer this act through the Public Health Service and under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such States.

#### "COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

"SEC. 2. The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this section, the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may adversely affect such waters.

#### "INTERSTATE COOPERATION AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 3. (a) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and control of water pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable, uniform State laws relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and encourage compacts between States for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of

water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

#### "RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND INFORMATION

"SEC. 4. (a) The Surgeon General shall conduct in the Public Health Service and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to other appropriate public (whether Federal, State, interstate, or local) authorities, agencies, and institutions, private agencies and institutions, and individuals in the conduct of, and promote the coordination of, research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the causes, control, and prevention of water pollution. In carrying out the foregoing, the Surgeon General is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information as to research, investigations, and demonstrations relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, including appropriate recommendations in connection therewith;

"(2) make grants-in-aid to public or private agencies and institutions and to individuals for research or training projects and for demonstrations, and provide for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

"(3) secure, from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of experts, scholars, and consultants as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);

"(4) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Public Health Service with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expenses, as he may deem necessary to procure the assistance of the most promising research fellows and

"(5) provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention, and control of water pollution to personnel of public agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications.

"(b) The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water pollution control agency or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view toward recommending a solution of such problem.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall collect and disseminate basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality, and such other information, relating to water pollution and the prevention and control thereof as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

#### "GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, \$2,000,000 for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"(b) The portion of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year which shall be available for grants to interstate agencies and the portion thereof

which shall be available for grants to States shall be specified in the act appropriating such sums.

"(c) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the water pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States.

"(d) From each State's allotment under subsection (c) for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under subsection (h)) of the cost of carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (f), including the cost of training personnel for State and local water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the State plan.

"(e) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to interstate agencies, in accordance with regulations, on such basis as the Surgeon General finds reasonable and equitable. He shall from time to time pay to each such agency, from its allotment, an amount equal to such portion of the cost of carrying out its plan approved under subsection (f) as may be determined in accordance with regulations, including the cost of training personnel for water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the interstate agency's plans. The regulations relating to the portion of the cost of carrying out the interstate agency's plan which shall be borne by the United States shall be designed to place such agencies, so far as practicable, on a basis similar to that of the States.

"(f) The Surgeon General shall approve any plan for the prevention and control of water pollution which is submitted by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of an interstate agency, by such agency, if such plan—

"(1) provides for administration or for the supervision of administration of the plan by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of a plan submitted by an interstate agency, by such interstate agency;

"(2) provides that such agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this act;

"(3) sets forth the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the State (or interstate) plan and in its administration;

"(4) provides for extension or improvement of the State or interstate program for prevention and control of water pollution; and

"(5) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan.

"(g) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State water pollution control agency or interstate agency finds that—

"(A) the plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of subsection (f) of this section; or

"(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement,

the Surgeon General shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State or to the interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State, or to the interstate agency, for projects under or parts of the plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the

Surgeon General shall make no further payments to such State, or to such interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or shall limit payments to projects under or parts of the plan in which there is no such failure).

"(2) If any State or any interstate agency is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(h) (1) The 'Federal share' for any State shall be 100 percent less than percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66 2/3 percent or less than 33 1/3 percent, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 2/3 percent.

"(2) The 'Federal shares' shall be promulgated by the Surgeon General between July 1 and September 30 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the 3 most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation.

"(i) The population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(j) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State (or to each interstate agency in the case of subsection (e)) under the provisions of such subsection for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State (or the interstate agency) and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Surgeon General may find necessary.

"(2) The Surgeon General shall pay to the State (or to the interstate agency), from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid such State (or such interstate agency) for any prior period under such subsection was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State (or such agency) for such prior period under such subsection. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installations as the Surgeon General may determine.

#### "GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 6. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, intercity, or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Surgeon General or in an amount exceeding \$500,000, whichever is the smaller; (3) no grant shall be made for projects under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Surgeon General for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grants shall be made for projects under this section until the applicant has made reasonable assurance satisfactory to the Surgeon General that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in construction of the project will not be less than the prevailing local wage rates for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law 403, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended.

"(c) In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Surgeon General to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for such Federal financial aid for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof. The Surgeon General shall make Federal funds available for such treatment works, in a manner which will tend to result in a wide distribution of such funds among the several areas of the United States for which comprehensive programs have been prepared or developed pursuant to this act to the extent practicable and not inconsistent with the criteria and limitations contained in this section.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year the sum of \$100,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section: *Provided*, That the aggregate of sums so appropriated shall not exceed \$1,000,000,000. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That at least 50 percent of the funds so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works servicing communities of 125,000 population or under.

"(e) The Surgeon General shall make payments under this act through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of constructing the project for which the amount was paid. As used in this subsection the term 'constructing' includes the engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures and other action necessary to the construction



of treatment works; and the erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of treatment works; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of treatment works.

#### "WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD"

"SEC. 7. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, composed of the Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be chairman, and nine members appointed by the President none of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this act, shall be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate and local governmental agencies, of public or private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with water pollution, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in the field of water pollution prevention and control, as well as other individuals who are expert in this field.

"(2) (A) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1956, shall expire as follows: 3 at the end of 1 year after such date, 3 at the end of 2 years after such date, and 3 at the end of 3 years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. None of the members appointed by the President shall be eligible for reappointment within 1 year after the end of his preceding term, but terms commencing prior to the enactment of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956 shall not be deemed 'preceding terms' for purposes of this sentence.

"(B) The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding \$50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(b) The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Surgeon General under this act.

"(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

#### "ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST POLLUTION OF INTERSTATE WATERS"

"SEC. 8. (a) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such water or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, shall be subject to abatement as herein provided.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this act, State and interstate action to abate pollution of interstate waters shall be encouraged and shall not, except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to court order under subsection (h), be displaced by Federal enforcement action.

"(c) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, at the request of any State or States or on

the basis of reports, surveys or studies, has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring, he shall give formal notification thereof to the State water pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originates and shall call promptly a conference of the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originates and of the State or States claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than 3 weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Surgeon General shall prepare and forward to all the water pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of pollution of interstate waters subject to abatement under this act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Surgeon General believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take necessary remedial action. The Surgeon General is to allow at least 6 months for the taking of such action.

"(e) If such remedial action is not taken or action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least 3 weeks' prior notice of said hearing shall be given to the State water-pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, called to attend the aforesaid hearing and the alleged polluter or polluters. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement is not being made, it shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send such findings and recommendations and of such notice to the State water-pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate.

"(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the written consent of the State water-pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to give such consent) of the State or States where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or at the written request of the State water-pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to make such request) of any other State or States where the health or welfare of persons is endangered by such pollution, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(g) In any suit brought pursuant to subsection (f) in which two or more persons in different judicial districts are originally joined as defendants, the suit may be commenced in the judicial district in which any discharge caused by any of the defendants occurs.

"(h) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the Board and a copy of the Board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(i) As used in this section, the term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of the State.

#### "COOPERATION TO CONTROL POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS"

"SEC. 9. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with any State or interstate agency or municipality having jurisdiction over waters into which any matter is discharged from such property, in preventing or controlling the pollution of such waters.

#### "ADMINISTRATION"

"SEC. 10. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this act. All regulations of the Surgeon General under this act shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Surgeon General may delegate to any officer or employee of the Public Health Service such of his powers and duties under this act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the United States, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

#### "DEFINITIONS"

"SEC. 11. When used in this act—

"(a) The term 'State water pollution control agency' means the State health authority, except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency.

"(b) The term 'interstate agency' means an agency of 2 or more States established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress, or any other agency of 2 or more States, having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the control of pollution of waters.

"(c) The term 'treatment works' means the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances, and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alterations thereof.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(e) The term 'interstate waters' means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, boundaries between two or more States.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, county, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

#### "OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED"

"SEC. 12. This act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes', approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

#### "SEPARABILITY"

"SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

#### "SHORT TITLE"

"SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the 'Federal Water Pollution Control Act'."

Sec. 2. The title of such act is amended to read "An act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes."

Sec. 3. Terms of office as members of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board (established pursuant to section 6 (b) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) subsisting on the date of enactment of this act shall expire at the close of business on such date.

Sec. 4. In the case of any discharge or discharges causing or contributing to water pollution with respect to which the actions by the Surgeon General prescribed under paragraph (2) of section 2 (d) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act, have already been completed prior to such enactment, the provisions of such section shall continue to be applicable; except that nothing in this section shall prevent action with respect to any such pollution under and in accordance with the provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by this act.

Sec. 5. This act may be cited as the "Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956."

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "agencies", insert "and to municipalities."

Page 3, line 21, after "United States", insert "for."

Page 5, line 9, after "(4)" strike out "establish and maintain research fellowships" and insert "provide and maintain opportunities for study."

Line 14, strike out "fellows" and insert "students: *Provided*, That the total sum authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for students pursuant to this subparagraph shall not exceed \$100,000;".

Page 6, line 13, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

Line 16, strike out "Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

Page 8, line 22, insert the following: "The Surgeon General shall not disapprove any such plan without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State water pollution control agency or interstate agency which has submitted such plan."

Page 12, line 12, strike out "installations" and insert "installments."

Line 16, strike out "intercity" and insert "intermunicipal."

Page 13, line 5, strike out "50" and insert "33 1/2."

Line 7, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$300,000."

Line 8, after "smaller" insert ": *Provided*, That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost;".

Page 14, line 16, strike out "his" and insert "this."

Line 18, strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000."

Line 21, strike out "\$1,000,000,000" and insert "\$500,000,000."

Line 25, strike out "communities" and insert "municipalities."

Page 15, line 8, after "includes", insert "preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 17, after "works", insert ": *Provided*, That in assuring that a fair distribution of grant funds hereunder is made available to the largest possible number of States, municipalities, intermunicipal or interstate agencies that have need for treatment works and in order that the initial feasibility of a project can be determined, the Surgeon General shall give priority to grants for advance planning in order to determine the preliminary economic and engineering feasibility of such projects."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER to the committee amendment: On page 15, line 22, after "shall", insert the following: "specify annually a portion amounting to at least 10 percent of the sums appropriated pursuant to this section to be used for advance planning grants to the maximum extent possible, and with regard to such portion."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is agreeable to both sides of the aisle. Its purpose is to clarify

ify the grant proviso that makes money available for advance planning. I think that is one of the problems that is the crux of this whole water pollution control legislation. The committee unanimously approved the proviso itself. This is a clarifying amendment to that proviso, so that all funds will not be tied up.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, this side agrees to the clarifying amendment. It is a good amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, in reporting on S. 890 and H. R. 9540, the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee offered an amendment to section 5, "Grants for water-pollution control program," which would increase the authorization for such grants.

The bill as originally introduced provided for authorization of \$2 million annually for 5 years making grants to States and interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of pollution. The bill as reported to the full committee increased this authorization to \$5 million annually.

This amendment was wisely conceived and properly supported by members of the subcommittee who understood the water-pollution problem and who wanted to deal with it realistically.

This provision is similar to one contained in the present Water Pollution Control Act, except that the Federal financial assistance in the bill under consideration is not restricted to studies of industrial waste. It is designed to assist the States in any aspect of their water-pollution-control programs.

Experience under the present act indicates that such financial assistance not only directly aids the States but also stimulates their interest in giving increased financial support to their water-pollution control programs. At the outset of the Federal financial-assistance program, 1950, the total annual expenditure by States—excluding Federal money—for water-pollution control was about \$2 1/4 million. The next year the total rose to \$3 million, 1951, and the following year to \$4 million, 1952. Then the Federal assistance was abruptly cut off. The following years, the total State expenditures not only ceased to rise but decreased.

Under the proposed authorization of \$5 million for State aid in the bill reported by the subcommittee, the amount available for the respective States would vary according to population, extent of their water pollution control problem and financial need. Even under this increased amount, 11 States would receive less than \$30,000 annually. But under



the amount provided in the bill as previously introduced, \$2 million, 25 States would receive less than \$30,000 annually. One State would receive less than \$1,500.

Small amounts are not usually acceptable to States because the trouble of conforming to legal and administrative procedures of the Government is not worth the small amounts received. The larger amounts provided by the subcommittee and committee amendments will materially serve to eliminate such inhibitions.

A 5-year program of Federal aid as authorized by the subcommittee's and committee amendments would not necessarily permit States to add permanently to their professional staffs, but it would permit them to purchase needed laboratory and other equipment which would far outlast the 5-year program. Moreover, it would also help the States adjust the salary scales of technical personnel to hold and attract the kind of employees needed for successful State operation of vital water pollution control programs.

I believe we do not want to be too little and too late with a strengthened water pollution control program. I recommend the more realistic version of the subcommittee and committee in amount.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 17, line 1, strike out "None of the members" and insert "Members."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 17, line 2, after "shall" insert "not".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 18, line 6, strike out "water" and insert "waters".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 18, line 17, after "of" insert "the water pollution control agency or the chief executive of".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, strike out lines 1 to 5 inclusive.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 6, strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 10, after "court," insert "giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 16, strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 10, line 9, after the word "less", strike out the word "than" and insert "that".

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, this merely corrects a typographical error changing the word "than" which is now in the bill to "that" which should be in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 12, line 14, strike out all of section 6, page 12, line 14, to page 15, line 24, both inclusive.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, and I hope I will not reiterate any argument made by me in general debate on the bill. I simply want to call the attention of the House to the three main reasons for opposing section 6 of the bill offered by the Department which will administer this law. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in their written report to the committee has this to say in recommending that section 6 be deleted from this bill. They say:

First, we do not believe that general municipal need for financial aid—and particularly Federal aid—for this purpose has been established. In developing our own legislative proposals relating to water-pollution control, we obtained the views of a number of municipal finance authorities and other persons familiar with this problem. We found no clear indication that municipal governments generally are unable to meet the costs of constructing waste-treatment works. The problem appears to be primarily one of the priority assigned by municipalities to the construction of sewage-treatment works in their capital financing programs, rather than one of financial inability.

Second, any justification for Federal construction grants in this field must, therefore, rest primarily on their value as an incentive to accelerate needed construction, rather than on a concept of financial aid to equalize the financial abilities of municipalities generally. Although a few States now have grant programs for this particular purpose, experience with such grants has been too limited to date to provide any clear evaluation of their advantages and limitations or of the most effective terms or conditions governing such aid.

Third, even if the need for Federal incentive grants were to be assumed, we believe that the grant provisions of H. R. 9540 are deficient in several important respects: (a) They do not provide for State sharing in the financing of the grant program or in the determination of relative needs and priorities; (b) the provisions relating to the geographical allocation of grant funds are so broad as to offer little guidance in project approval; (c) there are no criteria specified to govern the assignment of priorities among eligible construction projects; and (d) the preference given to smaller municipalities is unnecessarily great and does not conform to the relative need for construction from the standpoint of water-pollution abatement.

This brief summary of their views on this proposal is to be found on page 31 of the report. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the 6 or 7 reasons they set forth in their third paragraph. Here is a department of the Government that has gone into this

matter thoroughly. They have made a thorough investigation. Now, they come forward and say to the Congress that section 6 is not needed and there is no need established, sufficiently at least, to put section 6 in the bill calling upon the Federal Government for the vast expenditures of money involved. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that the issue is pretty well drawn, and apparently there is going to be an issue decided more or less on the basis of political alignments in the House.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DONDERO), who preceded me that there is no information coming from the municipalities that would be affected under section 6 to indicate that they are opposed to this type of legislation.

At this point I want to read into the Record the position of the American Municipal Association on this particular question, and section 6 in particular. This is addressed to me as a Member of Congress:

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1956.  
The Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAILEY: On behalf of the 12,000 cities who are members of this association, we urge your support of the Water Pollution Control legislation, H. R. 9540, now being considered by the House. We are particularly anxious for your support of section 6 of the bill which provides for Federal grants to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants.

We have set forth our reasons for favoring Federal construction grants in our testimony before the House Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors (see pp. 244-254, 268-276). Water pollution is a national public health problem and because of the interstate nature of pollution the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to assist in its abatement.

It is significant that the only time that construction of sewage treatment facilities has kept pace with increased pollution was in the period from 1933-39. This was the period when Federal financial assistance was available to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants.

One of our most valuable natural resources is water. Already an estimated 14 million Americans live in water-shortage areas. In nearly all of these areas pollution is a large factor in the amount of usable water available.

Each year we as a nation fall further behind in the fight against pollution. H. R. 9540 is the first bold step on the long road back to sensible water conservation policies. We urge your favorable action on this vital legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK HEALY, Jr.,  
Executive Director.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow that up by asking that I be permitted to read into the Record the following telegrams:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., June 11, 1956.  
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.:  
Residents of Morgantown and Monongalia County will appreciate your efforts for approval of H. R. 9540 Blatnik water pollution

and sewage disposal bill. Personally urge your support.

ELMER W. PRINCE,  
City Manager.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., June 12, 1956.  
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Congressional Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The passage of the water pollution and sewage disposal bill is important to the sanitation, growth, and welfare of many communities located on the banks of many streams in West Virginia. As mayor of Charleston, W. Va., I respectfully urge you to lend your full support and effort to the passage of this piece of legislation.

JOHN T. COPENHAVER.

WESTON, W. VA., June 12, 1956.  
Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Member, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the Weston Board of Trade, I urge the passage of a water pollution and sewage disposal bill that gives Federal aid to the cities to assist them in the construction of a sewage disposal plant.

HAROLD G. COTTRILL.

WESTON, W. VA., June 12, 1956.  
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Congressman, Third West Virginia  
District,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Understand water pollution and sewage disposal bill comes up for vote Wednesday. We urge its approval.

NETTIE V. DAVIS,  
Executive Secretary, Weston Chamber  
of Commerce.

WESTON, W. VA., June 12, 1956.  
Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Member of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

As mayor of the city of Weston, I urge the passage of a water pollution and sewage disposal bill that gives Federal aid to the cities to assist them in the construction of a sewage disposal plant.

GERALD L. HAYES,  
Mayor.

ELKINS, W. VA., June 12, 1956.  
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Member of Congress,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the people of the city of Elkins, we request and urge your utmost support on H. R. 9540, now pending in Congress.

E. P. PHARES,  
Mayor, City of Elkins.

CLARKSBURG, W. VA., June 13, 1956.  
HON. CLEVELAND BAILEY,  
New Congressional Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Clarksburg Chamber of Commerce sincerely urges your utmost efforts toward including provisions in bill 9540 which enable cities to receive aid.

WALT SCHRADER.

CLARKSBURG, W. VA., June 12, 1956.  
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge approval of H. R. 9540.  
W. WALTER NEELY.

MOUNT HOPE, W. VA., June 12, 1956.  
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Congressman, Third West Virginia District,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Understand H. R. 9540, Blatnik water pollution and sewage disposal bill up Wednesday.

day. Passage is a must for all cities under 10,000 population. Please use every effort toward passage. Kindly write at once giving full particulars pertaining Bureau of Mines Building.

W. BERNARD ROCKE.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.,  
June 12, 1956.

CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

These cities need help. Would appreciate all your best efforts toward passage of water pollution and sewage disposal bill.

HUNTINGTON SANITARY BOARD.

PARKERSBURG, W. VA.,  
June 12, 1956.

CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.:

Citizens of Parkersburg, W. Va., hereby strongly urge the approval of House rule, bill 9540.

FRANK W. GOVE, Jr.,  
Mayor, City of Parkersburg, W. Va.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.,  
June 12, 1956.

CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Urge all maximum efforts toward passage of H. R. 9540, Blatnik water pollution and sewage disposal bill. Cities must have assistance.

GEORGE E. THEURER,  
Mayor, Huntington.

CHARLESTON, W. VA.,  
June 11, 1956.

CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Member of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

Understand H. R. 9540, water pollution bill, will be taken up June 12 or 13. Appreciate your favorable consideration.

DR. N. H. DYER,  
State Director of Health.

OAK HILL, W. VA., June 12, 1956.

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Urge passage H. R. 9540, water and sewage bill.

H. C. BROWN,  
Mayor, Oak Hill, W. Va.

BUCKHANNON, W. VA., June 12, 1956.  
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

We are for H. R. 9540, Blatnik water pollution and sewage-disposal bill, 100 percent.

J. D. HINKLE,  
Mayor.

WESTON, W. VA., June 13, 1956.  
Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
Member, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

Send copies of H. R. 9540. State ordered construction of sewage-disposal plants. Unbearable burden to small municipalities. Benefits not local but inure to both State and Nation. Urge passage of H. R. 9540.

JOHN HOLY,  
City Attorney for City of Weston.

WESTON, W. VA., June 13, 1956.  
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your using your influence in behalf of H. R. 9540. Please call WHAW, Weston, collect, when you can give us a report. Regards.

GEORGE YAZELL.

WESTON, W. VA., June 13, 1956.

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request passage of H. R. 9540, Blatnik water-pollution and sewage disposal bill.

ROBERT S. EARLE,  
Weston Democrat.

These communications are all pleading for the approval of this legislation, including section 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

First, I want to join in the tributes being paid to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the author of this bill. He has done a wonderful job with this legislation. When this program becomes law, especially section 6, I hope it will be recognized by the country as due to the work of JOHN BLATNIK.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that an effort is being made to strike from the bill what a large section of the country believes to be the most important part of this legislation.

This section of the bill, of course, changes existing Federal authority, but it is nothing new. As has been pointed out earlier in the debate, the only time any real progress was made in this country in establishing municipal sewage disposal plants was during that period when there were matching funds from Federal grants under the PWA program. All the real major advance that has been made in this work was in the period of the thirties through the use of PWA funds.

I was surprised by the vehemence of the opposition to this section by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the insistence by the Department that all of this program should be done by municipal bond issues. In trying to find why there was such insistence about this I looked into the hearings and found that committee members raised that same question. They asked what was one of the reasons why the Department had arrived at the conclusion that there should be no Federal assistance, but that it should all be done through municipal bond issues.

They called a meeting of municipal finance authorities to help them make a decision on it, and according to the official record of the hearings on page 148 the people who made these recommendations against the Federal participation were representatives of the Chase National Bank, a representative of Stone, Rowe & Foreham, a representative of Wainwright & Ramsay, a representative of R. W. Ramspeck & Co., investment bankers, and a representative of the Life Insurance Company of America. In other words, these were all people who wanted to handle these loans. They recommended that the municipalities and States be required to make them. I do not blame those people for wanting to prevent the grants and I do not blame them for bringing what pressures they could exert upon the administration to keep them from supporting such a program to bring it about.



Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If I understand the gentleman's bill correctly, his bill is to encourage communities in issuing bonds, the same as the bankers did.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I cannot understand why they do not look at it from the long-range viewpoint.

Mr. CEDERBERG. So the argument of the gentleman is not valid in this case at all.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I quite agree that it is not valid in the long-range sense that these grants will bring about these programs.

I think the best experience we have had to show the value and necessity of this program is the experience we have had under the Hill-Burton Act. All of us are familiar with areas of the country where there was a crying need for more hospital facilities, just 10 years ago. Everybody recognized the fact, everybody recognized that it was primarily a municipal responsibility to provide those hospital facilities, but they did nothing about it until the incentive was provided in the Hill-Burton Act. As a result we are meeting the hospital crisis in the country; it is a major problem no longer.

This is the same type of program; unfortunately, the grants are not great enough, and they are not based upon the same type of formula as the Hill-Burton grants were based.

I have been constrained to refrain from offering an amendment to provide that the grants be in greater proportion along the lines of the Hill-Burton Act in the interest of preserving what we have here, but I think the history of what has happened under the Hill-Burton program makes clear the necessity for this program. There are many municipalities all over the country that need these programs but that are not going to establish them until they have the incentive of the grant. That is an unfortunate fact, but true nonetheless.

We have got to put through a program like this if we are going to enable the municipalities to meet that problem. The municipalities are entitled to that Federal grant. The type of taxation program we have means that the Federal Government takes the taxes from the small towns and it goes into the big areas and it has to come from there.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out something that I think we lose sight of when we debate the amount of money involved in this legislation. Detroit, for instance, has been mentioned and the need for money for a sewage disposal plant. But how much will \$300,000 do? One municipal plant, any type of sewage treatment plant, will run into millions of dollars. I know of one treatment plant in my own county that was completed a short time ago, and we have spent \$32 million on that plant. Here we want to appropriate a few thousand dollars, and it is claimed that is going to be a great deal of help.

Mr. Chairman, beyond that I want to make one other point. I wonder how

many Members here realize when they say municipalities and the States do not have the money what their State legislatures do? Let them check the State legislatures and their local governments and see how many States have within the past year or two increased the taxes for highways within the States, how many of the States have increased the taxes for other types of facilities that it is said here are not half as important as water is to our people and the elimination of pollution. If we can tax our people within the States for these other facilities, it seems to me quite certain we can carry out our responsibilities within our States and within our municipalities and pay our own way as we go along.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to hear the gentleman express his solicitude for the municipalities. I would like to know if the gentleman will join with me in an amendment which would raise the amount of the grant to be made to any individual municipality and the total overall amount that could be granted?

Mr. BECKER. I am sorry I could not do that. I would not be consistent in my position and in my opposition to these grants-in-aid which are absolutely unnecessary, in my opinion.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief since the things I might have said have been stated far better than I can say them.

I want to add one or two considerations, however, that I do not feel have been stressed sufficiently here today. We all agree we want conservation of our water resources. There is no argument about the goal; the argument is simply the means to be employed.

I call your attention to the bill and to the minority report. I strikes me that on the face of the bill itself we are asking for a stronger State program, more research, more technical assistance: a stronger State program. Then we say: Hold everything. We have a Federal grant coming for you. The bill is self-contradictory.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the States will be encouraged to strengthen their program if they know they can get it from Uncle Sam. Now where does this money come from? It comes out of the taxpayers' pocket. We will not have more but less money to build these plants by getting back our own money via the route of Washington.

In depression times, much was said for the public works projects which were proposed to create work and build systems like this. But at a time like the present, in the most prosperous period in our history, surely we can leave it to the localities to build their own systems. Here is another case of conflict between States rights and the huge expanding Federal bureaucracy.

The second point I would like to raise is simply this to point out the fallacy of the new grant-in-aid. If we are going to grant money who is going to get the money? Are we in each of our re-

spective States going to start a race with each other competitively? Should I check my district and State and tell them to be on the alert so that we may get our share of the number of projects to be made available, and, of course, there cannot be many projects of this nature even with the grant money available.

I would like to call your attention to the minority report. I know you have many other things to do, and possibly you have not read it, but if you could read the minority report before the vote is taken, I believe you would find it to be of information.

Let us not lose sight of one thing: Everyone here is deeply interested in the conservation of the Nation's water resources. And I think we all agree that control of pollution is one of the major means of achieving water conservation.

Let us see what the experts themselves say about grants for sewage treatment construction.

One of the Nation's outstanding engineering publications—the Engineering News Record—recently called a group of experts together to consider this very question. Here is what one of these experts had to say about it.

I quote:

It is difficult to escape the kind of cynicism about the Federal grants-in-aid if you live long enough. As an old PWA director, I had considerable interest and considerable part in the initial legislation for public works grants-in-aid in the thirties.

And skipping a bit:

It is very interesting to compare the thirties with 1956. In the thirties we went to Federal grants-in-aid because we were literally in the dumps financially. We now talk of Federal grants-in-aid in the most prosperous period that this country has ever seen, and I confess it is a little difficult for me to prove to myself the necessity of turning to Washington for help when I believe the resources of the country are at their maximum. I myself feel that both States and others would be retarded in installations, not necessarily by the grant-in-aid but by the promise of the grant-in-aid, which is held dangling in front of you, and which in quantity is not really much of a stimulant. Unless you move to the billion dollar level you don't get the shot in the arm.

This statement was made by one of the Nation's outstanding engineering authorities in the water resources field—Prof. Abel Wolman, of Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. Wolman knows better than to be taken in by the glittering promise of Federal assistance.

To quote him again, very briefly:

I would remind you—

He told the conference—

that PWA grants increased costs of construction, did not decrease them. As a matter of fact, the record would show that the 45 percent grant just about represented the increased cost, and you would have been just as well off without it.

When a man of Abel Wolman's vast experience in the water resources field sends up a warning like that, I believe we should stop to take a long hard look before plunging into a program of the kind contemplated in the construction-grants section of this bill.

And let me say that a good many experts in the pollution-control field agree with Wolman. Many of them did at the recent meeting.

Further, I submit that the construction-grants section contradicts every other provision of the bill.

What is the use of strengthening State pollution-control programs, of perfecting the enforcement procedures, of stepping up the research effort, and so on, if you turn around in the same bill and say to the cities and towns of America: "Hold everything. There are grants-in-aid on the way."

I say, let us give our States and local communities the kind of help that they do need and can use to develop more effective pollution-control programs of their own. Let us not discourage that kind of initiative with the glittering promises of Federal financial assistance.

In short, let us strike this provision from the bill. I think then we would have the basis for a sound program of pollution control in this country.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during one summer between terms of school a classmate and I undertook to sell a set of volumes on agriculture to the farmers of our area. As I say, we undertook and offered to sell that set of volumes. We did not have too much luck. This friend of mine tells this story about an episode he said occurred to him. He said he was talking to one farmer and finally became so frustrated that in desperation he asked, "Well, don't you want to learn how to farm any better?" The farmer replied, spitting out a stream of tobacco, "I do not see how it would help me much, because I ain't farming half as good as I know how now."

I know some Members have the idea that is the attitude of the cities and municipal governments. Some Members are obviously under the impression that the cities are not tending to their jobs as well as they know how. Members have intimated that the municipalities are negligent or derelict in their duty; that they have failed to provide pollution control simply because they have not been willing. Friends, that is the farthest thing from the truth that could possibly be. The reason the cities of America have not been able to keep pace with this rapid growth and the rapid need of pollution control is because they have been caught in a squeeze, a fearlessly insistent and tenaciously gripping financial nutcracker between rising costs and restricted sources of income. In some areas of our country as many as 70 percent of the municipalities have exceeded or have reached their legal limits of debt assumption.

You say to them, "Here, take care of this problem," and I say to you that it is a national problem and a national responsibility and one that we cannot avoid, when we realize that by 1975 according to the most reliable statistics available, our Nation is going to need two and one-half times as much water as we are using today and when we realize that since 1920 the organic pollution in our streams has increased by 82 percent. So what has been a local re-

sponsibility has become a national problem; and so it thereby becomes a national responsibility. We can pass pious platitudes; we can say we believe in these things, but if we cut the heart out of the bill, then we share with those municipalities the responsibility for not keeping pace by falling farther and farther behind in this struggle to keep our waters safe from pollution.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. You say the cities are not able to take care of this problem. How is it that 30 percent of the municipalities of the United States have already done so?

Mr. WRIGHT. The city which is my home has done so, and the suggestion has been made that it is not fair to those who have temporarily—and I say "temporarily" because most of these cities are growing—have temporarily solved this problem to permit aid to other cities which have not. Well, that would be like saying it is not fair to those cities which have solved their hospital problems for us to have the Hill-Burton Act, or that it is not fair to give them aid toward the construction of schools in defense-impacted areas. Any kind of a bill could be objected to on that ground. Any time we start a new program that argument could be lodged against it, that it is not fair to those who have already taken care of their own needs. I do not object and the city I represent does not object, even though they have temporarily, at least, taken care of that problem.

It has been suggested that \$300,000 would not be particularly helpful. Three hundred thousand dollars is one-third of a \$900,000 installation. On the basis of average costs across the country, it may be estimated that a \$900,000 installation would be adequate, wholly, to serve a population of 100,000. I do not think it is a very realistic argument, therefore, to suggest that this is an inadequate sum to help in individual communities.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is the gentleman suggesting if you have a \$900,000 sewage disposal project that you can get a \$300,000 loan?

Mr. WRIGHT. No; I am saying nothing about loans. The terms of the bill are that the Federal Government may grant in those cases where the State authority has approved the project up to one-third, but in no case to exceed \$300,000 for the construction of a municipal sewage disposal plant.

We do not need to go any further than the Potomac River to see the sickening sight of a stream that once ran clear and fresh and pure, now contaminated by a careless civilization which has been too preoccupied with growth to take care of the preservation of the purity of that which nature gave us.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, section 6 of this bill is an idle gesture and we should recognize it for what it is. Ten years ago, when the Antipollution Act was passed, there was a provision for an authorization of \$22½ million. Not one cent has ever been appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations of this House. When you get into a program as gigantic as this, I cannot imagine, knowing the members of the Committee on Appropriations, that they would ever recommend appropriation of one dime of the money that is sought to be authorized in this bill. That will mean that the entire sanitary program of this country will be delayed for at least 2 years. I have telegrams and letters from municipalities saying, in effect, sure, they want to get a free ride if they can. I have telegrams stating that they would like to know the outcome of this bill, because they are proposing a bond issue—in the case of one city, from whom I have heard in which they advise that they are calling for a bond issue of \$10 million to put in a sanitary system, but, they advise "We are holding off until we know what is going to happen to this bill."

What you will be doing is this: You will be delaying the sanitary improvement program all over the United States.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BLATNIK. With reference to the gentleman's suggestion that the Committee on Appropriations has refused to appropriate money for that purpose, I should like to give him the answer to that, because I have those hearings right here.

Mr. SCUDDER. You will have to secure an appropriation in order to get the money to match or whatever the method would be to split up the money.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, to clarify that once and for all, here are the hearings on appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1957, and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is questioning a representative of the Department. It went something like this:

"Last year the committee refused a request for \$145,000 for certain activities on the ground that the act was really unenforceable. Do you agree with that or were we wrong?"

Repeatedly they had contended that the enforcement provisions in the existing law were unworkable and the Committee on Appropriations refused to appropriate the money. So instead of coming through with \$22½ million and other aid, they appropriated only \$11 million in 8 years. We now have an enforceable law, a workable law, and we think it will work. But they must have the means with which to do that which we are trying to do and that is to provide these sewage disposal facilities.

Mr. SCUDDER. The gentleman's guess and my guess may be equally good. But my guess is that the Committee on Appropriations will not appropriate money to start a new giveaway program



to be handled from Washington at this time. We are trying to balance the budget. We are trying to economize a bit. I do not believe this Congress is in any position to embark upon a program of this sort. I seriously feel that you will not do one bit of good with this bill if you leave in the appropriation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I heard the gentleman say in general debate that the bill sent over by the Senate was almost identical with the bill passed by the 80th Congress.

Mr. SCUDDER. I did not mention that bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Somebody made that statement. Let me tell the gentleman why they have not asked for it and why there was not any appropriation. It is because it was not workable. A 10-year loan to a municipality does not mean anything because they would have to have at least 30 years to get revenues out of the use of the sewage facility to pay off the loan. It was not workable. Nobody asked for it. If the bill is not any better than that, you had better just put it in the wastebasket.

Mr. SCUDDER. The purpose of this bill was to extend the present law and amend it to give to the Federal authorities the proper law to stop pollution of our streams. I am in thorough agreement with the purpose of this bill, but feel that section 6 is an unnecessary gesture and will retard the building of proper sewage disposal plants. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Minnesota think we had better limit the time on this amendment and all amendments thereto in order to get through with the bill? I understand two other pieces of legislation are to follow this one today.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am anxious to get through as soon as possible. However, we have 3 or 4 Members on this side who have kindly consented to wait this long to speak, but they would like to be heard. I suggest a limitation of 20 minutes. How would that be?

Mr. DONDERO. Twenty minutes would be all right.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM and Mr. DEMPSEY objected.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, my object in taking the floor at this time is to support the bill. I notice Members on both sides of the aisle are for the bill, with the exception of section 6. That is where the money is provided. They will give you everything but the money needed to purify the waters of American

streams, at an estimated cost of \$50 million a year.

Some gentlemen have asked, "Where is the Federal Government going to get the money?" The same place it has been getting it down through the years, from the people of the respective States. The Federal Government has tapped them so severely that they are having trouble getting by in the States. The Federal Government has no money other than that which it obtains from the States, and the States, unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, do not have the same authority the Federal Government possesses insofar as levying taxes is concerned.

The greatest natural resource known throughout the world is water. The water tables of America have been going down State by State, year by year. Not too long ago in the city of New York, the greatest city in the world, there was a sign in each bathroom, "It is patriotic to avoid taking a bath on Thursday." That was to conserve water.

We are not only trying to conserve water, we are trying to purify it so that that which we have will be usable and drinkable. You do not have to visit very many places in the United States until you find yourself where you cannot take a drink of water unless it has been purified and bottled. You just cannot drink it out of the faucet. If you do, you will be stricken with some kind of amoebic infection before very long.

We have authorized projects in the various States that make this appropriation, or authority for an appropriation, look very modest. So far as the need is concerned, there is not one project we have authorized this year which is of as great value as this project we are discussing now. And under those circumstances some say that we will authorize everything except the money to build the project, while at the same time we are giving to every country on the earth that will hold its hand out many times what we are asking for here. When we come to the foreign-aid programs, some among us do not ask, "Where is the Government going to get the money?" I think pretty soon we had better be asking that question, because we have been bled white. I think the time has arrived when the people of the United States of America should at least be sure that the waters that flow through the rivers of this country will not be poisonous and death-dealing. That is exactly what we are confronted with now. I think the House should approve this bill and certainly defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to strike out the \$50 million contained in the bill. This has to do with the health and welfare of the people of America. We, who are supposed to represent them—and I say "supposed" advisedly, I think, should just consider a little bit how far we should go in a matter of this kind and where we should stop. I should certainly not stop too soon when it comes to the health of the people of the United States.

As a Representative from a Southwestern State it is difficult indeed for me to understand why there should be the slightest objection to or question about the need for the enactment of this

legislation. In our part of the country water is the veritable lifeblood. Whenever even a small percentage of that water is polluted or contaminated, especially during the recent years of extended drought in New Mexico and her neighboring States, it is a serious blow to virtually every phase of our economy. For that reason the people whom I have the honor to represent are perhaps more keenly aware of the vital necessity for this legislation than are most others.

We know from long and sad experience that our fight against pollution has not been very effective. In fact, I believe we are justified in calling it a losing fight up to now. This legislation proposes an extension of the present law which expires at the end of this month but, more important, it sets up a program of Federal, State and local cooperation that is essential for preservation of the health of our people throughout the Nation—for protection of human life. If it was intended to accomplish no more than that, there is ample justification for its enactment. But it goes farther. It not only will conserve our water resources but it will provide more adequate and effective protection for our wildlife resources as well—for our game and birds in the fields and the fish in our streams. It is so far-reaching in its potential benefits that it becomes one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Congress in this session.

There is a striking parallel between this water pollution control bill and the Federal Aid Highway bill which recently passed and is now in conference. Both are intended to provide a comprehensive, well-planned, long-term program to correct a condition that has become an increasingly dangerous threat to our country over the years. Experience has taught us that our previous approach to development of the Nation's highways has been ineffective. They have constantly deteriorated under the piecemeal policy we have followed. The same is fully true of the water pollution problem. It is just as vital to attack that problem with the same well-planned, thoroughly coordinated utilization of the combined resources and machinery of the Federal, State and local governments. Only in that way can we overcome this threat to our national health and welfare. And so I say there is a direct parallel in regard to development of the Nation's highways and protection of its water resources. The same basic reasoning should apply in both cases.

While this legislation has been pending, which is a long time in view of the urgency of its enactment, I have received from health officials, conservationists, farmers and ranchers and many others who are cognizant of the situation, fervent pleas for its passage. Those pleas were not based upon selfish interest. They were made by those who are in a position to have full understanding of the enormous toll in lives and resources that pollution of our waters is taking. The facts and the records that they present, based upon their firsthand knowledge, are so stark that they cannot be accepted with complacency. The losses incurred are even more disastrous

than those occasioned by the ravages of war, but they are not as spectacular, therefore we have not regarded them with the same concern.

There is every justification for the participation by the Federal Government provided in this legislation. Pollution of the waters of our streams does not stop at State lines. It cannot be controlled by the individual States or local communities, acting alone. Until we take action and provide the program set up by this bill we will not have met the responsibility with which we are charged. The only reason we are here, the only reason why the people of our respective districts send us to Congress, is to protect their welfare, their lives, their property and the security of their Nation—in short, the public interest. This legislation encompasses every one of those reasons. In my opinion, we are morally and legally bound to enact it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 20 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time would that give each Member standing?

The CHAIRMAN. That will allow approximately 2 minutes each.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was amazed a moment ago to hear the gentleman from Texas state that 70 percent of the communities of the country were already bonded to their complete limit of indebtedness and, therefore, he was making the argument that they could come to Uncle Sam for some money. I think Uncle Sam is going to come before the Committee on Ways and Means one of these days and ask for some more power to go over the debt limit right now. I believe, perhaps, Uncle Sam is having difficulties on his own. So, we should think in terms of Uncle Sam as well as in terms of our own communities.

Mr. Chairman, while I am in favor of the pending bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, I am unalterably opposed to section 6. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] to strike the section from the bill.

There is no question as to the value of the Water Pollution Control Act, originally enacted in the 80th Congress, as a Federal-State cooperative program to conserve our water resources and to promote national health. But, Mr. Chairman, the entirely new program proposed by section 6 is an absurdity.

This section would have the Federal Government make grants to States and municipalities for the construction of sewage-disposal plants. While the bill before us would authorize only \$500 million in Federal grants for this purpose, we surely know that this would only be the beginning. If a few States or a few municipalities are given Federal aid, are not all the States and all the municipalities entitled to such aid? Once you begin, where do you stop? Where

and how do you draw the line that there may be at least some equality of treatment?

Over the years we have seen any number of Federal grants-in-aid programs initiated. Once initiated we have seen them grow and grow, with the appropriation demands for this program and that increasing year by year.

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt the program proposed by this section we will embark the Federal Government not only upon an entirely new activity, which is a State or local problem and responsibility, but we will initiate one of the most gigantic Federal spending sprees we have ever seen.

Perhaps there can be a showing that some States and some municipalities have not adequately provided for waste-treatment facilities. But that does not mean they need, or should be given, financial aid from the Federal Government. On the contrary, the fact is that the respective States and municipalities are in much better financial condition than the Federal Government. Because some States and some municipalities have been negligent in meeting their sewage treatment needs is no valid reason why the Federal Government should undertake to grant them funds they can provide for themselves to meet the need.

There are any number of cities, some in my District, who have recognized their responsibility for pollution control and have raised the funds to build adequate disposal plants. Some have an existing bonded indebtedness. If we are to have a Federal-aid program of this character, is it not logical that the aid should also be extended to those who have met their local or State responsibility in this respect? Are the communities in my District now to be called upon to help others construct such plants while they struggle to pay off the debt on the plant they themselves out of their own funds constructed?

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge the adoption of the pending amendment to delete section 6 from this bill.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize it is getting late in the afternoon and the day has been very hard and trying on the Members of this body. After 18 years of service in this House, this afternoon is the first time I have ever objected to a unanimous consent request to limit debate on an amendment. I dislike especially to do this because I have such a high regard for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], whose service is going to be greatly missed in this body, as he is retiring after this session of Congress. His views and advice on all matters pertaining to flood control and related matters that come from this great Public Works Committee, I have always taken seriously; so I have no intention of needlessly detaining the House. But I think Members who are vitally affected by this legislation should have the opportunity of expressing their viewpoints.

I know the importance of this legislation; therefore I am opposing the amendment to strike out section 6, which provides some help in the way of

matching funds for those communities throughout the country that are not in a position financially to meet the requirements laid down by this legislation and also by State laws. I am in such a position in my own State in North Carolina. There is a river running through my district which serves a community of approximately 300,000 people. This river has become so filled with organic matter that the pollution problem has become almost intolerable.

I do not think I have ever heard a better explanation of a piece of legislation than has been made here on the floor of this House this afternoon by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BLATNIK]. Certainly we all have different problems in different areas of the country. Yesterday we passed a bill primarily for water in the western part of the United States. Some 17 States will benefit from this legislation, which carries millions of dollars of authorization. I realize, of course, that it costs money to do anything of this nature; so in opposing this amendment which deletes matching funds, we are asking for an amount to at least initiate a program that we hope will not let us fall any lower in the pollution situation than we are at the present time in trying to clean up our streams here in the eastern part of the United States.

It has been shown here this afternoon by charts that we will not be gaining any ground on this problem due to the increased use of our streams by the people but we will only be able to probably remain in the position we find ourselves at the present time.

Today there is not a beach from Maine to Florida that is not involved in this pollution problem, as well as our commercial streams upstate. We are not only polluting our streams beyond the usable point, but we are running the pollution out over the recreation areas in the eastern part of the country and it is creating a serious problem from coast to coast.

We all are aware today of what recreation means to the dense populations here in the East. How long are we going to let this go on is the number one question.

I believe and have thought for many years that the efforts to meet this problem should be coordinated between the local communities, the State, and the Federal Government, if we expect to be successful in our efforts.

Those who have presented this amendment this afternoon to strike out the matching funds have given as their reason for not supporting section 6 the fact that a Government agency, namely, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has come before the committee and asked for no matching funds. I have never heard of a Government agency coming in here to Congress and asking us to adopt a policy on any problem and not requesting implementing funds to carry out the program. That is a strange procedure to me. So why should they come in here today and ask us to adopt a water policy for the entire country and then object to putting at least as a beginning sufficient funds to start the program off.



I hope this House this afternoon is not going to support an attempt to refuse at least sufficient funds to initiate a program which I feel will be appreciated by the whole country over the years to come. We can implement it later on if this is not sufficient, but let us lay down the policy completely as to what our intentions are so the country at large will know what the policy really is.

As I have mentioned before, I have a lot of small communities up and down Haw River, which traverses Alamance County and Orange County from one end to the other in my congressional district. If this enforcing provision in this act forces them to do certain things, these communities cannot meet the requirements of the act without assistance from some source.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman is quite familiar with the bill, but I might call his attention to page 6, section 5 where funds are allocated to the extent of \$5 million.

Mr. DURHAM. I know it does carry some money, but the amendment will knock out all of the matching funds. I am primarily interested in these funds, and I am opposing the amendment presently before us for this reason.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I beg to differ with the gentleman. The amendment that is before us for consideration applies only to section 6. I am speaking of section 5.

Mr. DURHAM. The Dondero amendment applies to section 6, to which I addressed my remarks.

Mr. MCGREGOR. But this money I am talking about is in section 5 and would not be affected by the amendment.

Mr. DURHAM. I am aware of the fact that the gentleman is speaking of section 5, which does nothing for these communities except offer advice and probably some research in trying to solve their problem. I ask the House to vote down this amendment for the reasons I have outlined to you this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay this House, at this late hour, any longer. This committee has brought out in my opinion a very sound measure and has implemented the measure of 1948 adopted by the 80th Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to use this 1 minute to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. As the gentleman knows, I introduced the bill, H. R. 8108, to provide for a study of pollution here in the metropolitan Washington area and authorize an appropriation of \$250,000, and also an authorization of \$50,000 to assist the States in research and surveys along the lines of the study and assist in that study.

Am I correct in my understanding that this bill would authorize such a survey, such a study by the Surgeon General in connection with an existing interstate compact, namely, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is my understanding; that is what it would do.

Mr. BROYHILL. It also provides funds to assist States in research and surveys in connection with the problem?

Mr. BLATNIK. Research and in enforcement, demonstration, and so forth.

Mr. BROYHILL. I think that is very important, and should encourage the Interstate Commission to proceed with this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] is recognized.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, permit me to join my colleagues in tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee on the splendid way in which he has handled this problem and the hearings on this bill, H. R. 9540. The committee also deserves much credit. This is a very important problem and this legislation is greatly needed. I support enthusiastically the bill before us with the exception of section 6. My interest and concern with this problem goes back a number of years when I served in the New York State Legislature and the chairman of the New York Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation. Together with the members of that committee, we participated in the creation of such interstate agencies as the Ohio River Valley Interstate Commission, the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the Interstate Sanitation Commission, and the Lake Champlain Commission. All of these interstate organizations actively working in our section of the country have concerned themselves with the problem of water pollution and our water resources.

Under the guidance of our New York Interstate Committee, the State of New York enacted the Ostertag law which provides for the machinery of the State's water pollution control act. We are making progress under this law and I want to point out that it concerns itself with not only the health aspects but the conservation and industrial aspects as well. Primary responsibility rests with the municipalities under this statute.

Mr. Chairman, there is little disagreement that clean water is a natural resource precious to the physical and economic well-being of the Nation. The need for conservation of that resource through control of pollution also has unanimous support.

As with any legislation that affects all people and all levels of government, however, there has been healthy discussion as to the best methods by which the Federal Government can assist. The water pollution control agencies of the States deserve great praise for their cooperative and helpful role in the development of legislation to extend the present Water Pollution Control Act.

Beginning with the hearings in the Senate in April of last year, representatives of many of these agencies cooperated with the committees of the Senate and House in defining a proper Federal role in the national pollution control effort. I am confident that their assistance along with that of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been invaluable to the Committee on Public Works in their deliberations on this bill.

Between sessions of this Congress, leaders in the pollution-control field, including many administrators of State and local programs, met in Atlantic City, New York, and Washington to coordinate their views on the amendments to the existing act. Instrumental in the conduct of these three meetings were such able administrators of State pollution-control programs as David B. Lee, director bureau of sanitary engineering, Florida State Health Department; Milton P. Adams, executive secretary, Michigan State Water Resources Commission; and Dr. Daniel Bergsma, State commissioner of health, New Jersey State Department of Health.

The latest of the conferences, which took place last February, in Washington, included members of the executive committee of the Conference of State and Territorial Health Officers and representatives of independent State and interstate water-pollution control agencies, the Council of State Governments, national conservation organizations, industry, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This conference resulted in the development of a common position by the participants on proposed amendments to the existing act. The recommendations of the conference, representing the efforts of some of the best medical, legal, and engineering minds in the water-pollution control field today, were incorporated in the bill H. R. 9540.

These recommendations dealt specifically with the sections on assistance to States, the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, and enforcement of pollution-abatement measures in interstate waters. The wisdom of the recommendations was soon proven. During the extensive public hearings held by the Committee on Public Works, 58 witnesses appeared to give statements. These witnesses included Members of Congress, representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, administrators of State and interstate water-pollution control programs, and representatives of conservation organizations, municipalities, industry, and other groups interested in water conservation through pollution control. The amendments recommended by the Washington conference was approved almost unanimously by these witnesses in their testimony. Thirteen administrators of State water-pollution control agencies were among those who testified orally and gave their wholehearted endorsement to the amendments. Most of the other State water-pollution control agencies submitted statements confirming their support.

Protection of the Nation's water resources against degradation by pollu-

tion is the issue before us today. The primary role of local and State governments in a nationwide effort to conserve water quality is recognized in H. R. 9540 as it is in the existing Federal law enacted in 1948. The Federal role of support and assistance to State and local governmental agencies has been established as a vital one during the life of the existing act. Extension and improvement of this authority is now uniformly supported by the representatives of the States and others deeply concerned. Future pollution-control progress in the United States, aided by the passage of this legislation, will be a fitting tribute to the conscientious efforts of these people and the States which they represent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] stated that the position of the State of Michigan was in opposition to section 6 of the bill. I am going to cite to you a letter from Mr. Milton P. Adams, executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

In the middle paragraph of that letter to me, Mr. Adams states:

Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DONDERO, and the Public Works Committee have given earnest and extended consideration to this bill. Any remaining differences of opinion on section 6, or other details, should be compromised if possible, but in no event prevent your favorable consideration and vote on the bill as a whole.

I also call attention to the following statement by the assistant attorney general of the State of Michigan, Mr. Olds, who appeared on behalf of the bill before our committee and testified in favor of the whole bill, including section 6.

Under this bill, in a 10-year period there will be 1,660 of these facilities built, or a program at the rate of 166 a year if we pass this particular bill with section 6 included. That is substantial progress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I intend to support H. R. 9540, which is a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

It is important that there be proper exercise of jurisdiction of the waterways of the Nation as a benefit to public health and welfare by the prevention and the control of water pollution. I will not develop further the purpose of the intention of the program which has been fully covered in the debate today.

I arise at this time for the purpose of opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, which proposes to strike out section 6 of the act, which is the section which authorizes Federal grants to municipalities for construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage, or other waste, into any waters, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

Time after time it was stated here today that municipalities in the Nation do

not need any Federal help for such purposes. Let me say to you that my congressional district is a classic example that the contrary is the case beyond the peradventure of intelligent debate. In the State of Pennsylvania there is a so-called Clear Streams Act, and as a result of that legislation, many municipalities in my congressional district, particularly those bordering the Susquehanna River in the Wyoming Valley, are under citation of contempt issued by the attorney general's office of our State, because of alleged failure to comply with the provisions of the State law on this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I will not belabor the point again as to the distressed economic condition existing in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania. Many of the municipalities in that area are bankrupt and in many other cases have reached the constitutional limit of their borrowing power. Crushed between the two millstones of rising costs of municipal government, and no additional sources of revenue, at the same time faced with compulsory legal action by the Commonwealth to erect sewage disposal plants, these municipalities are between the "devil and the deep blue sea."

Section 6 of this bill is absolutely essential as a single ray of hope; a straw at least, at which these municipalities may grasp to comply with mandatory State directives for construction of the necessary treatment works.

There now exists in my valley a joint committee of honest and sincere municipal officials and civic community leaders working together to solve a seemingly insoluble problem on the financing of such facilities construction. For months and months these municipal leaders and officials have been meeting and planning and hoping to comply with the law of the State.

No one debates or disputes the value of this legislation; we all know the essentiality of conserving our national water supply and to clean up and prevent the pollution of existing supplies; but I say to you Mr. Chairman, in my district the municipalities simply cannot pay their way if they are forced to share the burden of the total cost of the necessary construction; either by themselves as single municipalities, or jointly with other adjacent municipalities.

That is why I opposed the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, that is why I shall support this bill, including section 6, for there is no section in the country more directly in point as the provision of section 6 of the act, than my own district. This is not just a question of large cities, or of cities even over 125,000 in population, but it affects seriously many small boroughs and townships, as well as smaller cities in the Nation, and specifically in my congressional district.

This problem in my district has been under study for several years. Our municipalities have contributed to a general fund to find the most reasonable, and the best plan or plans to comply with the State law; so there will be no danger of our municipalities going halfcocked in such a construction program. At the same time the municipalities in my district will not hold back on the issuance of bond issues for such construction,

waiting for Uncle Sam's handout. If we could afford to do this ourselves we would not want any aid from the Federal Government, but we cannot afford, and we cannot raise the money, and that is that. This bill does not eliminate the home rule, it is not an extension of absolute Federal control over our municipalities; if it were, I would have nothing to do with it, but it is not. Nor does it deprive the State waters pollution control agency of jurisdiction. The bill provides for Federal participation and for local participation, as it should be. And no grant shall be made under the Federal law to any project in an amount exceeding 33 1/3 percent over the estimated reasonable costs, or in an amount exceeding \$300,000, whichever is the smaller. There are other and proper safeguards upon local control in the municipality and proper State jurisdiction.

Under all the provisions of this act, this is the very best kind and most desirable kind of association between the different governments to which each contributes for the good of all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

#### THE NEED FOR CONSTRUCTION GRANTS TO MEET OUR POLLUTION MENACE

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, after hearing and participating in the Public Works Committee debate on H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, I have been trying to understand why certain members of the Committee were so determined in their opposition to section 6. This section would simply make small Federal grants-in-aid available to municipalities for the construction of waste treatment works. The amount of money which could be given in support of any one project could not exceed \$300,000 or one-third of the cost of the project whichever were the smaller. Obviously, these small grants would be most beneficial to smaller communities or for the improvement or addition to existing facilities of the larger communities.

In view of the large amounts of Federal tax money which have been expended on the conservation and development of water resources, it is difficult to understand the motive of those who oppose this minimal program to conserve water resources by keeping our rivers and streams reasonably free from pollution.

I cannot help but suspect that certain manufacturers, notably the pulp and paper companies, have opposed this section of the bill for their own selfish reasons. We suspect that these companies would like to continue to use the Nation's waters for waste disposal purposes without properly treating the damaging effluent from their mills. I cannot help but feel that they do not want our municipalities to set a good example in pollution abatement because this would make it even more apparent that all industry must follow suit by providing adequate waste treatment measures. It should be noted that some industries have played a role of leadership in development of pollution abatement facilities and that those who



have opposed this legislation are not supported by some of our most outstanding industrial concerns. Certain fallacious arguments were offered in opposition to section 6 in the minority report of the Public Works Committee on this bill. This incidentally is the only section which the minority chose to oppose publicly. In its arguments the minority claims that most of our municipalities are in better financial condition than the Federal Government. This statement is denied by the American Municipal Association, a group which should know as much about the financial condition of our municipalities as any other agency. The same argument might be raised against the expenditures of Federal money for protection against flood damage. I cannot believe that the minority is sincere in raising this kind of an objection to a program for Federal financial assistance which is designed to do a job and to fill a need that States and cities have been unable to meet.

The minority also objected to section 6 because people of certain municipalities, who have already paid for the construction of waste treatment works, will be taxed a few cents individually for helping other communities to construct much-needed treatment facilities. I am completely dumbfounded by this kind of argument for several reasons. One is that any city is benefited by the construction of treatment works upstream. Moreover, this line of reasoning ignores the fact that cities which now have treatment plants may find that these have to be expanded or altered. Federal grants would be available to the cities of this country for such improvements, remodeling, and necessary alterations.

The opponents to section 6 and to other provisions of this bill certainly must have only a subjective basis for their arguments. Anyone who wants a high standard of living for his children wants clean streams. We know from wide experience that we can conquer the water pollution menace only by making up for the losses that we have experienced in years past. We must go on the offensive with a realistic program for control of water pollution.

Everyone claims to be against pollution just as they are against sin. The time has passed to let George do it. We need action not platitudes. We know from experience that Federal action coupled with the cooperative programs of the States is the only way we can hope to get the job done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9540, the bill we are considering to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. This bill would authorize, first, continuation of Federal-State cooperation in the development of water pollution control programs; second, increased technical assistance to States particularly on new and complex problems; third, intensified and broadened research to determine the effects of pollutants on public health and other water uses and to develop better and more economical methods of waste treatment; fourth, increased aid through

the conduct of and grants for demonstrations, studies, and training; fifth, broadened matching grants to States and interstate agencies for their water pollution control programs; sixth, matching grants to municipalities, States, and interstate agencies for the construction of needed treatment works; seventh, continued encouragement of interstate cooperation; eighth, assistance in the development of improved State water pollution control legislation; ninth, improved procedures for State-interstate-Federal collaboration on abatement of interstate pollution; and, tenth, encouragement of prevention and control of pollution from Federal installations. These are all most worthy and needed programs.

My interest in this legislation has been deepened by the several letters I have received in support of section 6 of H. R. 9540, which would provide Federal funds to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants. Also, a letter from the American Municipal Association points out that water pollution is a national public health problem and because of the interstate nature of pollution the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to assist in its abatement.

The association also makes the point that the only time that construction of sewage-treatment facilities has kept pace with increased pollution was in the period from 1933 to 1939. This was the period when Federal financial assistance was available to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants.

As an example of the support H. R. 9540 has received from municipal officials in my district, I quote from a letter from the Honorable C. V. Jackson, mayor, town of Pulaski, Va.:

We here in Pulaski have followed with considerable interest the activity in the Congress with regard to the possible establishment of Federal funds to localities for assistance in sewage treatment plant construction. The cost and necessity of treatment plants is currently being forcefully impressed on us inasmuch as Pulaski is now in the process of developing plans for the calling of a bond issue which will amount to a total of \$1 million.

\*\*\* We have delayed our work here in this direction, realizing the tremendous expense involved and the burden which would be placed upon property owners and sewer users to finance such a project.

Mayor Jackson explains that the Virginia Water Control Board has expressed concern over the pollution of the New River, and then points out that this river is a tributary to the Ohio River.

It is our feeling that since the construction of a sewage treatment plant by a municipality in the situation that we in Pulaski find ourselves is a matter of concern well beyond our corporate limits, and is a matter of equal concern even beyond the limits of the State, that it should become a subject of Federal interest—

The mayor states.

I have other letters of a nature similar to Mayor Jackson's.

Mr. Chairman, one of our Nation's most valuable resources is water. Already an estimated 14 million Americans live in water-shortage areas, and in nearly all of these areas, pollution is a

large factor in the amount of usable water that is available.

Federal financial aid for the building of sewage-treatment works will provide an incentive to local municipal officials to take immediate action to eliminate pollution from the waters of the Nation. This cost-sharing plan will make it possible for towns and cities that are already hard-pressed for funds to build sewage plants.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the strength of this Nation does not depend exclusively upon the endurance, the staying powers of its pocketbook nerve. Contrary to a somewhat widely held viewpoint, our ability to defend ourselves is not confined solely to the number of aircraft we are able to purchase—the number of hydrogen bombs we can afford to stockpile—and the billions we manage to contribute to foreign aid.

Its real strength flows from the hearts, the blood, and the sinews of the American people. And the source is their physical well-being, their social contentment, and their economic stability. To advance and maintain these, gentlemen, is our responsibility.

It is, therefore, a continuing source of amazement to me that when so vital an issue as the health of this Nation is before us, we debate the cost of essential safeguards as though this richest of all nations was teetering on the brink of bankruptcy. We authorize the expenditure in a single fiscal year of \$3.8 billion from our Treasury for foreign aid without a shudder. We see the wisdom of spending \$51.5 billion over the next 13 years to improve our roads.

But when it comes to the one thing no man can live long without—a glass of drinkable water—we haggle over the pennies.

Many of our colleagues, Mr. Chairman, have traveled abroad extensively during the past 3½ years. I should like to inquire how many of them were warned not to drink the water in this or the other country until they were sure it was boiled. And, as they then thought longingly of the safe taps in their own kitchens, I wonder if this did not seem further convincing proof of the superiority of our American way of life.

This conviction would, however, be somewhat shaken, I fear, by a simple inspection tour of our Potomac River Basin here at home.

The legislation we are considering today, Mr. Chairman, is a bill entitled "to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act." It has been described as an improved water pollution control bill, passed after 8 years of experience under the old Water Pollution Control Act. But to my mind, it is the first really adequate legislation the Congress has yet considered to protect the vital water supply and to safeguard the health of the Nation. I am supported in this view by such responsible sources of public opinion as the American Municipal Association, the Conference of Mayors of the United States, State and interstate water pollution control administrators, conservationists, industries,

municipalities, and other affected interests.

There is no single doubt in my mind but that West Virginia, as well as the rest of the country, will benefit immeasurably from the enactment of this legislation.

The provisions of the bill strengthening research, technical assistance, and State programs are essential prerequisites to the cleaning up of the Nation's water. In particular, I wish strongly to endorse its construction grant provisions. These, to a large extent, incorporate the provisions of bills which I have introduced in previous sessions of the Congress.

We must recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there is a Federal obligation here. The waters of this country are no resisters of State boundaries. If we consider that the rivers of this country total 3 million miles and that the treated and untreated wastes of 95 million people are being discharged into these waters daily, we must see that pollution is not completely a local matter. Of course it affects local people. But it also affects the people below—on rivers hundreds of miles from the point where pollution takes place.

West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, is a State of winding rivers and fast-flowing streams. Consequently, it is a member of two interstate commissions founded under the Water Pollution Control Act of June 30, 1948—the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. In accordance with the provisions of these compacts, the West Virginia Legislature has enacted effective measures to abate the pollution of streams and rivers.

Most of the cities in my district are on the Ohio River or its tributaries. The West Virginia Water Commission, as an agency of the Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission, has ordered all these cities to construct sewage facilities to halt pollution of the Ohio River. I am proud to say that many of them are in various stages of compliance with this order.

Some communities, however, find themselves unable to act because they do not have the financial resources; because they have exhausted their constitutional debt limit; or because they are experiencing difficulty in finding a market for sewage revenue bonds, even though the interest rates here are relatively high.

As examples, the city of Benwood has been unable to interest a bonding company in financing a sewage system; the city of Weirton has been experiencing difficulty in securing advance funds for engineering services from HHFA; and in the city of Follansbee, I am informed, State limitations on bonded indebtedness prohibit the city from floating a bond issue sufficient to finance a sewage system.

As the American Municipal Association brought out during its excellent testimony on the bill, H. R. 9540, before the House Public Works Committee, thousands of municipalities which do not own their water systems cannot find money to construct sewage treatment

plants, because bonding houses are uninterested in a revenue producing bond issue unless it is tied in with the water system.

Follansbee, Wellsburg, St. Mary's, and Sistersville, W. Va., find themselves in this predicament. All of these communities and their officials are now subject to citation for noncompliance with the order of the West Virginia Water Commission to build sewage plants. Yet, they are powerless to take remedial action until financial assistance is made available to them. This assistance will either come from the Federal Government through the enactment of this bill, Mr. Chairman, or there will be no sewage plants built in these municipalities—to the endangerment of the health of their populations.

To those who would argue that responsibility for water pollution control must rest with the local community, I should like to point out that this bill accomplishes just that. It undertakes to place responsibility upon the local community to initiate projects. So that while the Federal obligation is recognized, it has created a partnership between the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities in the effort to clean up water pollution, which, as the testimony before the Public Works Committee has shown, has become a menace to the health and progress of this country.

The record will show that the only one time in our history, during the 1930's, when there was Federal aid available under the WPA and PWA programs, did construction of treatment works keep pace with the need.

If we are to begin to meet this serious problem of water pollution now, such Federal aid must again be made available. As I have pointed out, in many of the communities of my State, and, I am sure, in every other State, there is the will to clean up, but these communities just cannot afford it. The construction grants authorized by section 6 of H. R. 9540 would enable these communities to get the job done. If we postpone this urgently needed action, the alternative will almost certainly be much larger Federal expenditures in the near future—and possibly under the dire circumstances of the serious impairment of the public health in key production areas essential to the national defense.

There is one other thought which I would like to offer for the consideration of our colleagues. I have the greatest respect, Mr. Chairman, for the banking industry. I am deeply aware of the service it has rendered the Nation in providing the capital and the financing which has enabled the country to become the greatest industrial nation on earth.

Nevertheless, it would seem to me that this present legislation falls into the same category as highway and school construction. When a municipality is compelled to issue revenue bonds to construct sewage treatment plants, the interest paid on these bonds over a period of years is often double the actual cost of construction of the plant. I do not believe that the banker who, along with

the baker and the candlestick maker, will also benefit from this construction in his community, desires to enrich himself at such cost to his fellow citizens.

The abating of pollution of the Nation's waters is not merely a dollar-and-cents proposition. It is a sound investment in the health, recreation, agriculture, and industry of our people—precious intangibles, immeasurable in terms of money.

I believe the enactment of this legislation, particularly the construction grant provisions, will enable the Federal Government and the States to initiate a long and urgently needed, aggressive program to abate the disgraceful pollution of this country's waters, so that we may, as part of our children's heritage, pass on to them, in usable condition, our most vital natural resource—clean water.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call to the attention of the House the interpretation as I understand section 6, and I refer to page 24, and I quote:

The term "interstate waters" means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, boundaries between two or more States.

There is no relief for any city that is now polluting international waters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment. The same amendment was defeated in the Committee on Public Works by a decisive vote of 26 to 8 and I hope it will be defeated at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONDERO) there were—ayes 98, noes 109.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. DONDERO.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 21, line 19, strike out "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take any substantial part of the 5 minutes to debate the amendment. It is self-explanatory. I ask the Members to turn to page 21 and look at line 19. My amendment simply proposes to strike out the word "or", the fourth word on that line, and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

As the paragraph now reads, the Attorney General is authorized to bring an action on behalf of the United States to abate a pollution nuisance upon the written consent of the State agency of



the State where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or upon the written request of the State which complains.

In my opinion it would be unwise to authorize the Attorney General to bring such an action in the name of the United States at the request of only one of the States affected. I think both of the States ought to concur in any such request.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment was considered very carefully in the committee. It was rejected by the States themselves, by all of them except 4, as I recall, 3 or 4 of the 44 that were involved.

The situation now is that neither party's rights are protected, the party discharging or originating the pollution or the party being harmed by the pollution, which may request the enforcement machinery to go to work. This means that if I am on a lower stream or downstream being polluted by you upstream, I can only request help from the Surgeon General if you agree to go along; and if you do not agree to it, there is nothing I can do. The States themselves have overwhelmingly turned this veto power of the polluting State down and by unanimous vote they adopted the language we now have in this bill.

I will say, not to be too facetious, that even though you own your own house you do not have any special right to throw garbage out of the second-story window onto the street below.

I do hope this amendment is rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were adopted it would take the heart right out of the enforcement provision of this bill. This amendment if adopted would mean that before you could bring an enforcement action by the United States Attorney General you would have to get the consent of the State where the polluter is located as well as the State that is being polluted. That would mean for all practical purposes that all the State where the polluter is located would have to do would be to refuse to give consent and we would have no enforcement.

I hope very much the Committee of the Whole rejects this amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Is this not proof that that is what is wrong with the watershed compact now? You never could get an agreement and you could not in this case.

Mr. BALDWIN. If this amendment were adopted, for all practical purposes we would have no enforcement of water pollution measures.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I agree with the gentleman's analysis of the amendment now pending before the Committee, I hope the amendment is rejected because if it prevails the enforcement section of the bill will be entirely lost.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment just to say that if this amendment is adopted it will destroy the enforcement provision of the bill, which is the heart of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: On page 5, strike out all of the lines 9 through 17.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offered this same amendment in committee when the bill was under consideration. The committee rejected my amendment 9 to 10. Because of the closeness of the committee vote on this amendment, I feel I should offer it here to allow the House an opportunity to work its will on the amendment.

My amendment in striking out lines 9 through 17 on page 5, if adopted, would remove from the bill authority for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to spend taxpayers' money to provide scholarships or fellowships to bright pollution engineering students. The funds would pay the traveling, tuition, and sustenance of these students while they were being educated to become pollution engineers.

The reason the Department wants to give these free scholarships or fellowships to students, officials of the Department told the committee, is because there is a shortage of pollution engineers and through scholarships the country could develop more competent pollution engineers.

The way to obtain pollution engineers, in my opinion, is not by providing free scholarships at taxpayers' expense to some students who want to study pollution engineering. The way to remedy the shortage is to pay pollution engineers, adequate compensation to attract engineering students into that field of effort.

The bill as originally drawn had no limit on what could be expended in providing these scholarships. When I offered my amendment in committee, the committee did place a limitation of \$100,000 a year on the amount that could be expended for these scholarships. That may be helpful, but it fails to meet my main objection to the Federal Government going into the new field of providing free pollution engineering scholarships.

There is an old-fashioned legislative practice here that is commonly called the technique of "getting the camel's nose under the tent" or "the foot in the door."

Under this technique, a department of Government gets a very small, often trivial amount into a bill for some new purpose. Then in following years the department comes back for larger and larger amounts until annual expenditure for the project which at first was very small grows into a gigantic annual cost to taxpayers. The final results of these many tiny items which eventually grow into giants digs deep into taxpayers' pocketbooks.

The present Federal income tax law is an example of how "the foot in the door"

and "camel's nose under the tent" technique works.

The income tax grew from a tiny baby when it was first born in 1913, in the brains of Government officials, until today it is of gargantuan proportions.

The first income tax proposal of 1913 must have sounded unimportant and something not to be feared by taxpayers. This first income tax of 1913 provided that all incomes of single persons above \$3,000 a year and married persons above \$4,000 should be taxed 1 percent and that incomes about \$20,000 to \$50,000 a year should pay an additional surtax of 1 percent.

Under this income tax of 1913, a single person with an income of \$20,000 paid an income tax of \$170 a year and a single person with an income of \$50,000 was taxed only \$770.

Today, however, the tiny baby income tax law of 1913 has grown so large that the single person with a \$20,000 annual income, instead of paying an income tax of only \$170, as he did in 1913, now pays \$6,412, and if his income is \$50,000 he now pays \$25,667 a year, instead of the \$770 he paid in 1913.

The national "foot in the door" and "camel's nose under the tent" income tax law of 1913 yielded the Federal Government a total of only \$71,381,275 in its first year. Last year, this original law with its taxes amended and increased year after year yielded the Federal Government \$49,914 million which was 698 times, or 69,800 percent, the amount collected by this tax in its first year.

The gasoline tax is another example of how the "foot in the door" and "camel's nose under the tent" technique results in trifling items growing to enormous size by year after year additions to them. The first gasoline tax, a 1 cent a gallon tax, was adopted in Oregon in 1919. This 1 cent a gallon Oregon gas tax collected only \$290,796 in its first year.

Now all States are levying this tax and have added to it and the Federal Government also collects gasoline taxes. Last year, the motorists of the Nation, instead of paying only \$290,796 in gasoline taxes, as they did in 1919, paid a total of almost \$5 billion in gasoline taxes to the States and Federal Government.

Congress should move slowly in entering into new fields of expenditures and taxation and not be lured into them by the siren's song that proposed new ventures in the beginning will cost little.

The item in this bill to provide free scholarships with travel and sustenance allowances to students who will study pollution engineering can open a new field of Government activity that eventually may cost many millions or even hundreds of millions annually.

Qualified engineers to carry on stream pollution engineering, admittedly, are scarce. Therefore it is argued Congress should vote taxpayers' money to provide a few special students with free tuition, free lodging, free food, free travel allowances, and free textbooks while they study pollution engineering. You may be sure the amount requested for this work now will be 2, 3, 5, or 10 times as large next year as the first request made in this bill.

Furthermore, if we start providing free scholarships to pollution engineers we may be sure we will soon be asked to provide free scholarships for prospective highway engineers, for engineers in the highway field also are scarce.

Then, also, there ought to be spent, and will someday, huge sums for flood control and river and harbor works. If we provide scholarships for pollution and highway engineering students representatives may be sure Congress will be asked to supply scholarships to students who want to become flood control or river and harbor engineers.

Starting these little new programs in new fields should not be undertaken by Congress lightly and without the fullest study of what these may lead to.

I am opposed to this proposal to provide free scholarships to prospective pollution engineers because I think such a new program eventually may establish a precedent that will result in a program that will cost the Nation's taxpayers an enormous sum annually.

The committee, when considering this bill, rejected my amendment by a 10 to 9 vote. Because of the closeness of the committee vote I offer my amendment to the consideration of the House.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this section was recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as being one that would return probably 20 to 1 on your investment. You know that we are quite short of scientists, chemists, and physicists. This will help to train chemists and physicists. In my district alone in one plant, we are short 200 chemists. We cannot get them. The committee was very much in favor, as I remember it, of this research program. In a research program, this is what happens. A fellow may be working on a master's degree. He gets the direction of a number of Ph. D.'s to direct him in his research. Now with the doctor's dissertation he has his work directed where he gives a great amount of time and gets the very best attention by the best experts. The Government gets all that at a very, very low figure. I asked some of the members of the Department who came over to the committee, what ratio would we have, and they said about 20 to 1 ratio.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 22, line 6, strike out lines 6 through 9.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the great Committee on Public Works, and I have the highest respect for that committee, are here invading the realm of the Committee on the Judiciary. They are proposing to provide in this bill what shall be admissible evidence in a court of law, and with all due respect to the Committee on Public Works, I think such a matter should

receive the attention and consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary. I really think those four lines should be stricken from the bill and that we should not undertake in a public-works bill to say what should be admissible in evidence in a court of law.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, that is another section which was discussed at quite some length. Mr. Minchner of the State of New Jersey was counsel for the Association of State Health Officers. They went over this point over and over and over again. They felt it should be retained. The vote was almost if not unanimous. There were, perhaps, 2 dissenting votes out of about 44. Then, in further consideration of some of the worries which the gentleman from North Carolina has, the committee went along and I urged it to add the additional language which follows on line 10 and I quote the language:

The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement

The health officers were opposed to this section. But, the industry people, primarily the paper and pulp industry people, were for it. We made a compromise and inserted that language at the request of the industry people to allay what fears they might have about the language of the bill.

Mr. JONAS. I am not opposed to the provisions of that section from line 10 through line 15. My only point is the question of the advisability of the committee deciding what should be admissible evidence in a court of law.

Mr. BLATNIK. I know the gentleman is not opposed to the language that follows. The industry people asked for language to safeguard them, and to consider the practicability and the physical and the economic feasibility of any abatement order. So, we balanced it all. We put in a section which the State health agencies wanted and we counterbalanced that with a section that industry wanted, and we made a compromise. If you strike out the section that the health agency passed over, and leave only that which industry wanted, then the other should be stricken also.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The language which the gentleman seeks to strike out did not originate with the Committee on Public Works. It is my understanding that it came over as a part of the bill passed by the other body.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. If we are going to take out any provision as to how the court should act on this matter, we should strike out the part that the gentleman does not object to, because that is a direction to the court also.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the construction that the gentleman from North Carolina has is not necessarily proper, because in line 9 it says "evidence which the court in its discretion deems proper."

So it leaves it in the discretion of the court, whatever it wishes to receive.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it is most pleasing to me that there is a large group of Members present today. The little farmer at last gets a break.

I have here an article appearing in the Denver Post of June 11, "Wheat Acreage Suit Dismissed by Breitenstein":

#### WHEAT ACREAGE SUIT DISMISSED BY BREITENSTEIN

Federal District Judge Jean S. Breitenstein has dismissed a case in which the Federal Government sought \$616 damages from two Durango farmers who allegedly planted more wheat acreage in 1954 than they were allotted by Uncle Sam.

The Government contended that Frank and John Bucovec, brothers, were allotted 20 acres but actually planted wheat on 42 acres.

Judge Breitenstein threw out the case in agreeing with Bentley M. McMullin, Denver attorney representing the farmers, the wheat was raised for use on the farms and had not been marketed under the Government parity laws.

So, at long last the little farmer is getting a break.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I wish to direct my remarks to the enforcement measures in section 8 which, although some improved over the expiring law, are entirely too weak. I sincerely hope this bill works. I hope that with the research and education and the grants proposed to help the States build up their own control programs, we can begin to make real progress toward halting and then removing this creeping cancer which threatens our economy and our security by destroying our vital water supplies.

The privilege of dumping municipal and industrial wastes untreated into the public waters amounts to a great, vested interest in this country. That is why any kind of pollution-abatement legislation, even the mildest kind, always has tough sledding, whether in a State legislature or in the Congress of the United States. That is why the mild and reasonable enforcement provisions of this bill have been attacked and misrepresented and amended in committee until they are larded with delays and entangled with redtape.

Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at the procedures under section 8 of this legislation:

First, a stream or lake or seashore that is polluted within the boundaries of a single State would not come under the



purview of this legislation. Pollution which arises in a State and damages the waters and the public welfare within the same State remains a cleanup task for that State, or for the local community. That is as it should be. I agree with the basic philosophy of H. R. 9540 which, like the Senate bill, S. 890, recognizes, preserves, and protects "the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution."

Section 8 (b) further declares that State and interstate action shall be encouraged and shall not, except as provided for clumsily by this act, be displaced by Federal enforcement action.

This law would apply correctly only to cases of interstate pollution, instances where pollution arising in one State flows through or across interstate waters and endangers the health and welfare of persons in another State.

But can the Federal Government simply move in and take direct action, after determining that such pollution does exist? Oh no, Mr. Chairman, the public is provided no such protection.

The first thing the Surgeon General must do is call a conference of the State or interstate agencies that should have acted long ago to bring about abatement. If they wish, the participating agencies can pack the meeting with outside persons and filibuster the conference to death.

Following the conference, can the Surgeon General take direct action? Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. Next he must prepare and send to the other conferees a summary of the conference, and he may recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take remedial action. And before doing another thing, the Surgeon General must wait 6 months to see if the State agency is going to move. Meantime, Mr. Chairman, the poisonous and contaminating wastes continue to pour into the stream, and the public continues to suffer.

After 6 months, if the State agency fails to move, can the Surgeon General then take direct action to require abatement?

Oh no, Mr. Chairman. Now he must call a public hearing and go through all the redtape of selecting a hearing board, making the necessary local arrangements, giving 3 weeks' notice, reporting and summarizing the proceedings, and waiting for the board to make its recommendations. Here, Mr. Chairman, is a place where a State agency that is inclined to drag its feet can delay action almost indefinitely. First it can delay by failing to select its representative for the hearing board. Then it can use a variety of tactics to delay an agreement on recommendations.

So finally, Mr. Chairman, the hearing board agrees on recommendations for abatement. Now the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can transmit the findings and recommendations to the person or persons causing the pollution. But the notice sent by the Secretary must specify a reasonable time—not less than 6 months—during which the poison can continue to pour into the streams and the public continues to suffer.

At last, after expiration of the reasonable time, the Secretary may resort to the courts, and bring suit to secure abatement. But he cannot go to court unless he is requested to do so by the State receiving the pollution or with the consent of the State in which the pollution originates. He must prove the pollution and that it is damaging the health or welfare of persons in another State. He must get around the loophole that directs the court to give "due consideration to practicability and physical and economical feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved."

Mr. Chairman, it could very well take 2 years at best to bring about abatement of interstate pollution under the provisions of this legislation. That is, 2 years after the situation becomes smelly enough to force the Surgeon General to call the first conference. Two years of delay and redtape while disease-laden sewage or poisonous chemicals continue to flow down the river, endangering the public health, destroying wildlife and recreation, depressing real estate values, eliminating business and industrial opportunities—because new industries cannot be established without clean water—destroying vital water supplies.

Two years, I say, at best. Let us add up the delays. Weeks or months setting up the first conference. Six months following the conference waiting for a State to act. More months selecting a hearing board and holding a public hearing. More weeks or months waiting for the board to make its recommendations. Another 6 months or more waiting for the polluter to secure abatement. Then, finally, all the delays of prolonged court proceedings that in themselves could take months or years.

Two years or more of redtape and delay, while the public suffers. Gentlemen, your tears for States rights under this legislation are crocodile tears. The rights really safeguarded by this bill are the vested rights of the polluters. What about the right of the general public to have clean water?

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it would be utterly impossible to execute an injustice under this legislation, except the very grave injustice of interminable delay while the public welfare suffers.

Mr. Chairman, I support this measure because it does represent some little improvement over the expiring law and because the public welfare demands some kind of program for abatement of interstate pollution. I hope it works and that the States and interstate agencies really cooperate. Because if it does not result in real progress toward pollution cleanup, Mr. Chairman, I predict the Congress will be writing much stronger legislation within very few years. The water-supply situation of this country is becoming critical.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] for his masterful presentment of one of the most important legislative measures that have come to the attention of the 84th Congress.

It will not be long before we are in our home districts making reports to our constituents. If this measure should

pass, which I feel confident it will, and should come unscathed from the conferees, we indeed will have a legislative accomplishment to the credit of the 84th Congress that we can take with pride to our constituents.

I was much impressed by the facts brought out in the argument of the gentleman from Minnesota. He has made it crystal clear in my mind that to a large extent the future of these United States depends on how well we develop and guard our water resources. It has been pointed out that at the present time we consume 17 billion gallons of water a day and that by 1975 the consumption will be 30 billion gallons a day. Pollution, it has been well said, is a waste of water. Pollution can be as deadly to water resources as the severest of droughts. This bill is aimed at minimizing that pollution.

It is a bill that reaches into and prepares for the future. But more than that, it gives protection to the health and the well-being of the men and women of today. Again I commend the able statesman from Minnesota for a great legislative contribution. His presentment has been outstanding. No one could have managed the floor fight with more earnestness or with more brilliant clarity.

During recent months I have received many letters from my constituents urging my support of this measure. I would say that the number of letters on this subject has been as large if not larger than that on any other matter. I have received no letters in opposition. Everywhere there has been shown an enthusiastic popular support.

Legislation providing for Federal participation in water pollution control was enacted in 1947. Almost 9 years of experience have shown the need of significant improvements over the legislation which will expire June 30.

Water pollution control is the key to water conservation. One of our greatest needs in the field of pollution control is to learn more about the complex substances that are reaching our streams and affecting the continued safety of our water resources for human consumption and other vital uses. The answer is in the broadened research which this legislation will provide.

State and interstate agencies will be supported by matching grants-in-aid to help them develop their programs to meet water pollution problems which are growing in magnitude and complexity.

The legislation under consideration incorporates several significant improvements over existing legislation, all based on experience gained since 1948. First, the new legislation permits the application of State grants to all essential phases of State programs on a matching basis. Secondly, research authority is broadened to permit contract research, research grants, and fellowship grants; and, thirdly, Federal enforcement procedures are clarified.

I trust the bill will pass by an overwhelming vote and without amendments weakening its purposes or narrowing its scope.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, pursuant to House Resolution 528, he reported the same back to the House, with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is qualified. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCGREGOR moves to recommit H. R. 9540 to the Committee on Public Works, with instructions to report the same back forthwith to the House of Representatives, with the following amendment: On page 12, line 14, strike out all of section 6, down to line 24 on page 15, inclusive.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 213, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—165

Abbitt	Church	Haley
Adair	Clevenger	Harden
Alger	Cole	Harrison, Nebr.
Allen, Calif.	Colmer	Harrison, Va.
Andresen,	Coon	Harvey
August H.	Coudert	Henderson
Arends	Cretella	Herlong
Avery	Crumpacker	Heselton
Bass, N. H.	Cunningham	Hess
Bates	Curtis, Mass.	Hiestand
Beamer	Curtis, Mo.	Hill
Becker	Dague	Hillings
Belcher	Davis, Ga.	Hinshaw
Bentley	Dawson, Utah	Hoeven
Berry	Derounian	Holt
Betts	Devereux	Hope
Boland	Dies	Hosmer
Bolton,	Dixon	Jackson
Francis P.	Dondero	James
Bolton,	Donovan	Jenkins
Oliver P.	Dorn, N. Y.	Jensen
Bosch	Dorn, S. C.	Johansen
Brown, Ohio	Ellsworth	Jonas
Brownson	Flno	Jones, N. C.
Budge	Fisher	Judd
Burleson	Fjare	Kean
Bush	Ford	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Frelinghuysen	Keating
Cederberg	Gary	Kilburn
Chase	Gentry	King, Pa.
Chenoweth	Gross	Knox
Chiperfield	Gubser	Krueger

Laird	Pillion
Latham	Poage
LeCompte	Poff
Lipscomb	Radwan
Lovre	Ray
McCulloch	Rees, Kans.
McDonough	Rhodes, Ariz.
McGregor	Riehlman
McIntire	Robeson, Va.
McVey	Rogers, Mass.
Maddonald	St. George
Mack, Wash.	Schenck
Mahon	Scherer
Mailliard	Scrivner
Martin	Scudder
Meador	Short
Miller, Md.	Shuford
Miller, Nebr.	Siler
Minshall	Smith, Kans.
Mumma	Smith, Va.
Nelson	Springer
Nicholson	Taber
Norblad	Talle
Osmers	Taylor
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.

NAYS—213

Abernethy	Forrester
Addonizio	Fountain
Albert	Frazier
Alexander	Friedel
Andrews	Fulton
Ashley	Garmatz
Ashmore	Gathings
Aspinall	Gavin
Auchincloss	Gordon
Bailey	Grant
Baker	Gray
Baldwin	Green, Oreg.
Barrett	Green, Pa.
Bass, Tenn.	Gregory
Baumhart	Griffiths
Bennett, Fla.	Hagen
Bennett, Mich.	Hand
Blatnik	Hardy
Blich	Harris
Boggs	Hays, Ark.
Bolling	Hayworth
Bonner	Healey
Bowler	Hollifield
Boykin	Holland
Boyle	Holmes
Bray	Holtzman
Brooks, La.	Huddleston
Brooks, Tex.	Hull
Brown, Ga.	Hyde
Broyhill	Ikard
Buckley	Jarman
Burdick	Jennings
Burnside	Johnson, Calif.
Byrd	Johnson, Wis.
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.
Canfield	Jones, Mo.
Cannon	Karsten
Carlyle	Kearns
Carrigg	Kee
Celler	Keogh
Chatham	Kilday
Chelf	Kilgore
Chudoff	King, Calif.
Clark	Kirwan
Cooper	Kluczynski
Corbett	Knutson
Cramer	Landrum
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham
Deane	Lankford
Delaney	Lesinski
Dempsey	Long
Denton	McCarthy
Diggs	McCormack
Dingell	McDowell
Dodd	Machrowicz
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.
Donohue	Madden
Doyle	Magnuson
Durham	Marshall
Edmondson	Matthews
Elliott	Merrow
Engle	Metcalf
Ewins	Mills
Fallon	Mollohan
Fascell	Morano
Feighan	Morgan
Fenton	Moss
Fernandez	Multer
Flood	Murray, Ill.
Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.
Forand	Natcher

NOT VOTING—54

Allen, Ill.	Bell
Andersen,	Bow
H. Carl	Carnahan
Anfuso	Christopher
Ayres	Cooley
Barden	Davidson

Thompson,	Gamble
Mich.	George
Thomson, Wyo.	Gwinn
Tuck	Hale
Utt	Halleck
Van Pelt	Hays, Ohio
Velde	Hébert
Vorys	Hoffman, Ill.
Vursell	Hoffman, Mich.
Wainwright	O'Hara, Minn.
Weaver	Patman
Wharton	Phillips
Whitten	Reed, N. Y.
Widnall	Richards
Wigglesworth	
Williams, Miss.	
Williams, N. Y.	
Wilson, Calif.	
Wilson, Ind.	
Winstead	
Withrow	
Wolcott	
Young	

Norrell	Reece, Tenn.
O'Brien, Ill.	Rhodes, Pa.
O'Brien, N. Y.	Riley
O'Hara, Ill.	Roberts
O'Konski	Robison, Ky.
O'Neill	Rodino
Passman	Rogers, Colo.
Patterson	Rogers, Fla.
Pelly	Rogers, Tex.
Perkins	Rooney
Post	Rutherford
Philbin	Sadlak
Pilcher	Saylor
Polk	Schwengel
Powell	Seely-Brown
Preston	Selden
Price	Sheppard
Priest	Sieminski
Prouty	Sikes
Quigley	Simpson, Ill.
Rabaut	Sisk
Rains	Smith, Miss.
Reuss	Spence
Rhodes, Pa.	Staggers
Riley	Steed
Roberts	Sullivan
Robison, Ky.	Teague, Tex.
Rodino	Thomas
Rogers, Colo.	Thompson, N. J.
Rogers, Fla.	Thompson, Tex.
Rogers, Tex.	Tollefson
Rooney	Trimble
Rutherford	Tumulty
Sadlak	Udall
Saylor	Vanik
Schwengel	Van Zandt
Seely-Brown	Vinson
Selden	Walter
Sheppard	Watts
Sieminski	Wier
Sikes	Williams, N. J.
Simpson, Ill.	Willis
Sisk	Wolverton
Smith, Miss.	Wright
Spence	Yates
Staggers	Younger
Steed	Zablocki
Sullivan	Zelenko
Teague, Tex.	
Thomas	
Thompson, N. J.	
Thompson, Tex.	
Tollefson	
Trimble	
Tumulty	
Udall	
Vanik	
Van Zandt	
Vinson	
Walter	
Watts	
Wier	
Williams, N. J.	
Willis	
Wolverton	
Wright	
Yates	
Younger	
Zablocki	
Zelenko	

Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dolliver
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chase
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Coudert

Lane	Rivers
McConnell	Roosevelt
McMillan	Scott
Mason	Sheehan
Miller, Calif.	Shelley
Miller, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Morrison	Smith, Wis.
Moulder	Thompson, La.
O'Hara, Minn.	Thornberry
Patman	Westland
Phillips	Wickersham
Reed, N. Y.	
Richards	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Anfuso against.  
Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Hébert against.  
Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Klein against.  
Mr. Hale for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Phillips for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. George for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Patman with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Horan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 338, nays 31, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—338

Abbitt	Belcher	Brownson
Abernethy	Bennett, Fla.	Broyhill
Adair	Bennett, Mich.	Budge
Addonizio	Bentley	Burdick
Albert	Berry	Burnside
Alexander	Betts	Bush
Allen, Calif.	Blatnik	Byrd
Andresen,	Blich	Byrne, Pa.
August H.	Boggs	Byrnes, Wis.
Arends	Boland	Canfield
Ashley	Bolling	Carlyle
Ashmore	Bolton,	Carrigg
Aspinall	Frances P.	Cederberg
Auchincloss	Bolton,	Celler
Avery	Oliver P.	Chelf
Bailey	Bonner	Chenoweth
Baldwin	Bosch	Chiperfield
Barrett	Bowler	Chudoff
Bass, N. H.	Boykin	Church
Bass, Tenn.	Boyle	Clark
Bates	Brooks, La.	Colmer
Baumhart	Brooks, Tex.	Coon
Beamer	Brown, Ga.	Cooper
Becker	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
		Coudert



Cramer	Hull	Powell
Cretella	Hyde	Preston
Crumpacker	Ikard	Price
Cunningham	James	Priest
Curtis, Mo.	Jarman	Prouty
Dague	Jenkins	Quigley
Davis, Ga.	Jennings	Rabaut
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Rains
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Wis.	Reece, Tenn.
Deane	Jonas	Rees, Kans.
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
Dempsey	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Denton	Judd	Rhodes, Pa.
Derounian	Karsten	Riehman
Devereux	Kean	Riley
Dies	Kearney	Roberts
Diggs	Kearns	Robeson, Va.
Dingell	Kee	Robson, Ky.
Dixon	Keogh	Rodino
Dodd	Kilday	Rogers, Colo.
Dondero	Kilgore	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	King, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Donovan	Kirwan	Rogers, Tex.
Dorn, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Rooney
Doyle	Knox	Rutherford
Durham	Knutson	Sadlak
Edmondson	Krueger	Saylor
Elliot	Laird	Schenck
Ellsworth	Landrum	Scherer
Engle	Lanham	Schwengel
Evins	Lankford	Scudder
Fallon	Latham	Seely-Brown
Fascell	LeCompte	Selden
Felghan	Lesinski	Sheppard
Fenton	Lipscomb	Short
Fino	Long	Shuford
Fisher	Lovre	Steminski
Fjare	McCarthy	Sikes
Flood	McCormack	Siler
Fogarty	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Forand	McDowell	Sisk
Ford	McIntire	Smith, Miss.
Forrester	McVey	Smith, Va.
Fountain	Maddison	Spence
Frazier	Machrowicz	Springer
Frelinghuysen	Mack, Ill.	Staggers
Friedel	Mack, Wash.	Steed
Fulton	Madden	Sullivan
Garmatz	Magnuson	Taille
Gary	Mailliard	Teague, Tex.
Gathings	Marshall	Thomas
Gavin	Martin	Thompson, N. J.
Gordon	Matthews	Thompson, Tex.
Grant	Meador	Thompson, Wyo.
Gray	Merrrow	Tollefson
Green, Oreg.	Metcalfe	Trimble
Green, Pa.	Miller, Md.	Tuck
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Tumulty
Griffiths	Minshall	Udall
Gross	Mollohan	Utt
Gubser	Morano	Vanik
Hagen	Morgan	Van Pelt
Haley	Moss	Van Zandt
Hand	Moulder	Velde
Harden	Multer	Vinson
Hardy	Mumma	Vorys
Harris	Murray, Ill.	Wainwright
Harrison, Nebr.	Murray, Tenn.	Walter
Harrison, Va.	Natcher	Watts
Harvey	Nelson	Whitten
Hays, Ark.	Nicholson	Widnall
Hayworth	Norblad	Wier
Healey	Norrell	Wigglesworth
Henderson	O'Brien, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Herlong	O'Brien, N. Y.	Williams, N. J.
Heseltun	O'Hara, Ill.	Williams, N. Y.
Hess	O'Konski	Willis
Hill	O'Neill	Wilson, Calif.
Hillings	Osmer	Winstead
Hinshaw	Ostertag	Withrow
Hoeven	Passman	Wolcott
Holifield	Patterson	Wolverton
Holland	Pelly	Wright
Holmes	Perkins	Yates
Holt	Pfost	Young
Holtzman	Philbin	Younger
Hope	Pilcher	Zablocki
Hosmer	Poff	Zelenko
Huddleston	Polk	

## NAYS—31

Alger	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Burleson	Kilburn	Taber
Chase	McCulloch	Taylor
Cleveland	McGregor	Teague, Calif.
Curtis, Mass.	Mahon	Thompson,
Dorn, S. C.	Pillion	Mich.
Hiestand	Poage	Vursell
Jackson	Radwan	Weaver
Jensen	Ray	Wharton
Johansen	St. George	Wilson, Ind.
Jones, N. C.	Scrivner	

## NOT VOTING—63

Allen, Ill.	Anfuso	Barden
Andersen,	Ayres	Bell
H. Carl	Baker	Bow

Buckley	Gwinn	Morrison
Cannon	Hale	O'Hara, Minn.
Carnahan	Halleck	Patman
Chatham	Hays, Ohio	Phillips
Christopher	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Cole	Hoffman, Ill.	Richards
Cooley	Hoffman, Mich.	Rivers
Davidson	Horan	Roosevelt
Davis, Wis.	Kelley, Pa.	Scott
Dawson, Ill.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheehan
Dollinger	King, Pa.	Shelley
Dolliver	Klein	Simpson, Pa.
Dowdy	Lane	Smith, Wis.
Eberharter	McConnell	Thompson, La.
Fernandez	McMillan	Thornberry
Flynt	Mason	Westland
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Gentry	Miller, N. Y.	
George	Mills	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. Bell with Mr. Reed of New York.  
 Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Horan.  
 Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Dolliver.  
 Mr. Klein with Mr. Scott.  
 Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Sheehan.  
 Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Cole.  
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bow.  
 Mr. Dollinger with Mr. McConnell.  
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Mason.  
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.  
 Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.  
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gamble.  
 Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.  
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. Davidson with Mr. Westland.  
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Phillips.  
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Miller of New York.  
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. George.  
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.  
 Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Halleck.  
 Mr. Chatham with Mr. Gwinn.  
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Hale.  
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.  
 Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Allen of Illinois.  
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Ayres.  
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Baker.  
 Mr. Cannon with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466j) is hereby amended to read as follows:

## "DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. (a) In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the prevention and control of water pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall administer this act through the Public Health Service and under the supervision and

direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such States.

## "COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS FOR WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

"Sec. 2. The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this section, the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may adversely affect such waters.

## "INTERSTATE COOPERATION AND UNIFORM LAWS

"Sec. 3. (a) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and control of water pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable, uniform State laws relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and encourage compacts between States for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

## "RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND INFORMATION

"Sec. 4. (a) The Surgeon General shall conduct in the Public Health Service and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to other appropriate public (whether Federal, State, interstate, or local) authorities, agencies, and institutions, private agencies and institutions, and individuals in the conduct of, and promote the coordination of, research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the causes, control, and prevention of water pollution. In carrying out the foregoing, the Surgeon General is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information as to research, investigations, and demonstrations relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, including appropriate recommendations in connection therewith;

"(2) make grants-in-aid to public or private agencies and institutions and to individuals for research or training projects and for demonstrations, and provide for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

"(3), secure, from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of experts, scholars, and consultants as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);

"(4) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Public Health Service with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expenses, as he may deem necessary to procure the assistance of the most promising research fellows; and

"(5) provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention, and control of water pollution to personnel of public agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications.

"(b) The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water pollution control agency or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view of recommending a solution of such problem.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall collect and disseminate such information relating to water pollution and the prevention and control thereof as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

#### "GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

"Sec. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, \$2 million for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The portion of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year which shall be available for grants to interstate agencies and the portion thereof which shall be available for grants to States shall be specified in the act appropriating such sums.

"(c) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the water pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States.

"(d) From each State's allotment under subsection (c) for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under subsection (1)) of the cost of carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (f), including the cost of training personnel for State and local water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the State plan.

"(e) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to interstate agencies, in accordance with regulations, on such basis as the Surgeon General finds reasonable and equitable. He shall from time to time pay to each such agency, from its allotment, an amount equal to such portion of the cost of carrying out its plan approved under subsection (f) as may be determined in accordance with regulations, including the cost of training personnel for water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the interstate agency's plan. The regulations relating to the portion of the cost of carrying out the interstate agency's plan which shall be borne by the United States shall be designed to place such agencies, so far as practicable, on a basis similar to that of the States.

"(f) The Surgeon General shall approve any plan for purposes of this section which is submitted by the State water pollution

control agency or, in the case of an interstate agency, by such agency, and which meets such requirements as the Surgeon General may prescribe by regulation.

"(g) All regulations and amendments thereto with respect to grants to States and to interstate agencies under this section shall be made after consultation with a conference of the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies. Insofar as practicable, the Surgeon General shall obtain the agreement, prior to the issuance of any such regulations or amendments, of such State and interstate agencies.

"(h) (1) Wherever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State water pollution control agency or interstate agency finds that—

"(A) the plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement prescribed by regulation as a condition of approval of the plan; or

"(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Surgeon General shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State or to the interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State, or to the interstate agency, for projects under or parts of the plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Surgeon General shall make no further payments to such State, or to such interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or shall limit payments to projects under or parts of the plan in which there is no such failure).

"(2) If any State or any interstate agency is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(1) (1) The 'Federal share' for any State shall be 100 per centum less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ per centum or less than 33⅓ per centum, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 per centum and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ per centum.

"(2) The 'Federal shares' shall be promulgated by the Surgeon General between July 1 and September 30 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the 2 fiscal years in the

period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided*, That the Federal shares promulgated by the Surgeon General pursuant to section 4 of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1955, shall be conclusive for the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1957.

"(j) The population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(k) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State (or to each interstate agency in the case of subsection (e)) under the provisions of such subsection for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State (or the interstate agency) and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Surgeon General may find necessary.

"(2) The Surgeon General shall pay to the State (or to the interstate agency), from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid such State (or such interstate agency) for any prior period under such subsection was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State (or such agency) for such prior period under such subsection. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Surgeon General may determine.

#### "WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

"Sec. 6. (a) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board to be composed as follows: The Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be Chairman of the Board, a representative of the Department of the Army, a representative of the Department of the Interior, a representative of the Department of Commerce, a representative of the Department of Agriculture, a representative of the Atomic Energy Commission, a representative of the National Science Foundation, and a representative of the Federal Power Commission, designated by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, respectively; and seven persons (not officers or employees of the Federal Government) to be appointed by the President. One of the persons appointed by the President shall be an engineer who is expert in sewage and industrial waste disposal, one shall be a person who shall have shown an active interest in the field of wildlife conservation and recreation, and, except as the President may determine that the purposes of this act will be better furthered by different representation, one shall be a person representative of municipal government, one shall be a person representative of State government, one shall be a person representative of affected industry, one shall be a person representative of interstate agencies, and one shall be a person who shall have shown an active interest in the field of agriculture. Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1955, shall expire as follows: two



at the end of 1 year after such date, 2 at the end of 2 years after such date, and 3 at the end of 3 years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. None of the members appointed by the President shall be eligible for reappointment within 1 year after the end of his preceding term, but terms commencing prior to the enactment of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1955 shall not be deemed 'preceding terms' for purposes of this sentence. The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding \$50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(b) The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to, the Surgeon General on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Surgeon General under this act.

"(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

#### "ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST POLLUTION OF INTERSTATE WATERS

"SEC. 7. (a) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, shall be subject to abatement as herein provided.

"(b) Whenever the Surgeon General, on the basis of reports, surveys, and studies, has reason to believe that any such pollution is occurring, he shall give formal notification thereof to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution and shall advise the water pollution control agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate of such notification. The notification shall specify a reasonable time to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(c) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notification pursuant to subsection (b) is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originate, before a board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary, who may be officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or of the water pollution control agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate (except that the water pollution control agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate shall be given an opportunity to select at least one member of the Board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the Board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the Board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring. If the Board finds such pollution is occurring, it shall make recommendations to the Secretary of

Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send a copy of such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send a copy of such findings and recommendations and of such notice to the water pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate.

"(d) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice prescribed in subsection (c) is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall send a further notice to such person or persons, and shall send a copy thereof to the water pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate. Such further notice shall specify a reasonable time (not less than 3 months) to secure abatement of such pollution. If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in such further notice is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, with the consent of the water pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to give such consent) of the State or States where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or at the request of the water pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to make such request) of any other State or States where the health or welfare of any person or persons is adversely affected by such pollution, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(e) In any suit brought pursuant to subsection (d) in which two or more persons in different judicial districts are originally joined as defendants, the suit may be commenced in the judicial district in which any discharge caused by any of the defendants occurs.

"(f) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the board and a copy of the board's recommendation; and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(g) As used in this section, the term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of the State.

#### "ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 8. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this act. All regulations of the Surgeon General under this act shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Surgeon General may delegate to any officer or employee of the Public Health Service such of his powers and duties under this act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the United States, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may

be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

#### "DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. When used in this act—

"(a) The term 'State water pollution control agency' means the State health authority except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency.

"(b) The term 'interstate agency' means an agency of two or more States established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress, or any other agency of two or more States, having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the control of pollution of waters.

"(c) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(d) The term 'interstate waters' means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, State boundaries.

"(e) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, county, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

#### "OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 10. This act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

#### "SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 11. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

#### "SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 12. This act may be cited as the 'Federal Water Pollution Control Act.'

SEC. 2. The title of such act is amended to read "An act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes."

SEC. 3. Terms of office as members of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board (established pursuant to section 6 (b) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) subsisting on the date of enactment of this act shall expire at the close of business on such date.

SEC. 4. As soon as possible after the date of enactment of this act the Surgeon General shall promulgate Federal shares in the manner provided in subsection (1) of section 5 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by this act (and without regard to the date specified therein for such promulgation), such Federal shares to be conclusive for the purposes of section 5 of such act for the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1957.

SEC. 5. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with any State or interstate agency or municipality having juris-

diction over waters into which any matter is discharged from such property, in preventing or controlling the pollution of such waters.

Sec. 6. This act may be cited as the "Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1955."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 9540 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendment and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. DEMPSEY, Mr. DONDERO, and Mr. McGREGOR.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 9540 was passed be vacated and that that bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the farm problem.

The President may veto a farm bill, but he cannot veto the farm problem. It just will not go away. I know that most of the newspapers have told you that the Democratic farm bill was bad. They have told you that the President was right in vetoing it—it would not help the farm problem. But, most of the provisions which the President termed "unacceptable," in his veto message, were income-raising provisions. Because of what you have read and heard on the radio and TV you may have decided that this is a black-and-white issue with all the white on the President's side and all the black on the Democrats' side. Let me assure you that this is not true. It is not a black-and-white issue and the black is not all on the Democrats' side.

Many of you do not farm for a living. You live in the big cities and the large towns. You probably think that the farm problem does not touch you. Many of you think about the farmer only when you go to the grocery store and spend more and more of your pay checks for groceries. Your thoughts then are harsh ones. You do not realize that the farmer gets a very small portion of the dollars you pay for your food. And that portion is getting smaller. The farmer's share of the dollars you pay for your food was 53 percent in 1945. It was 41 percent in 1955. The farmer's share of your food dollar has been steadily declining, and so has his income. Our great American economy consists of many different groups, but they are all bound together. What hurts the small-business man in New Orleans is bound to hurt the farmer in Kansas. And when the farmer in Kansas is hurt, the rest of us will be in trouble.

Sometimes I think the city man has trouble with the farm problem because of words like "parity." But let us look at the word "parity." All it means is this: If a farmer could buy a hat 20 years ago for a bushel of wheat, the farmer ought to be able to buy a hat today for a bushel of wheat. All parity really means is a fair price. Now, we do not say that the farmer must get a fair price for his crop. All we say is that the farmer should get 90 percent of the fair price. Would you settle for only 90 percent of a fair wage? Do you think your telephone company would be happy with only 90 percent of the fair rate? They feel they are entitled to 100 percent. Parity is just an insurance policy. The Government has been issuing similar insurance to us for decades. Your social security payments are a kind of insurance. The protective tariff for business, the subsidies to airlines and to the shipping industry; the land grants which made our railroads great, the minimum wage for workers—all of these are Government insurance policies designed to protect you and keep our economy healthy. Ninety percent of parity does the same thing for farmers.

#### THE NATIONAL ECONOMY AND DEPRESSIONS

Since 1952, wages have been going up. Corporate dividends have been going up. National income has increased \$33.1 billion, from \$289.5 billion in 1952 to \$322.6 billion in 1955. But during this same period of time the income of the farmer has been going in the opposite direction—down. If the farmer cannot make a living he cannot buy the things he needs—the things produced by the other groups of the economy. We know that when one part of our country or our economy remains in a depressed state, the depression will ultimately fan out into other parts, seriously affecting continuing prosperity. The worker who is making automobiles, televisions, agricultural machinery and tractors must have a market for his product. If the farmer cannot buy, the size of the market for these products is reduced. This means that the workers—in the automobile, television, and agricultural machinery factories—will be thrown out of jobs.

When they are unemployed, they cannot buy. The market is therefore reduced still further—thus more workers will be thrown out of work. And so it goes. Those of us who are over forty years of age know this from experience. We know that now is the time to do something about the depressed state of the Detroit, Mich., area and other industrial areas where so many workers are presently unemployed. We know that now is the time to stop the decline of the farmer's income, so that he may continue to buy the things he wants and needs. We know that now is the time, because soon it may be too late. Yes, we know that depression or threatened depression in any part of our economy is like a cancer. It will spread to all of the other parts of the economy.

There was a national depression in 1929. All industry was paralyzed until the Democrats came into power in 1933 and put the country back on its feet. But we older people remember that the farm depression started long before 1929. In fact, it started in 1920 and the agricultural economy remained depressed for the next 9 years in the midst of prosperity for the rest of the country—a prosperity which closely resembled the prosperity we have today. Those of us who have studied the farm problem are aware that this period of farm depression was due in large measure to changes in the world market and the inflation and speculation brought about by the war. But, we also know that the right kind of help to the farmer in the early 1920's would have stemmed the tide of depression. It would have helped to slow down the shrinkage in consumer buying power, and the enormous reduction of nonfarm production which led to the 1929 depression. For the past 7 years, the agricultural economy of our country has been sinking deeper and deeper into a state of depression. Farmers' income is declining. The costs of the things the farmer must buy have been increasing. He is caught in a squeeze between the high cost of goods to him and the low price he receives for his products. That is why we have worked so hard to help the farmer. His income must be bolstered, not only for his own sake but for our own sake; otherwise, we may well be on our way to another depression.

Under the leadership of Senator ELLENDER, the Agriculture Committee has traveled all over the United States exploring the farm problem. The House Agriculture Committee under the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has taken much testimony. Both committees have held hearings in an effort to determine what the farmer and farm experts thought should be done. The farm bill which we passed, and which President Eisenhower vetoed, was the product of years of hard work and searching study. Many Republicans who live in the farm areas supported the bill. They knew that something had to be done. They knew that by 1955 the average per capita income of farm people, from all sources, had fallen to \$860 a year and to only \$584 a year from farming alone. The 1955 average per capita income for city and town dwellers was \$2,000 a year. The Democratic farm



bill was designed to bolster the farmer's income. Experts say that a level no lower than 90 percent of parity will halt the slide of farm prices.

#### REPUBLICAN PROMISES

Do you remember that last year, with the approval of President Eisenhower, the minimum wage was raised to \$1 an hour? What would happen if this year it should be cut to 80 cents an hour? President Eisenhower campaigned for 90 percent of parity as the best thing for the farmer. During the campaign of 1952 when he was running for the Presidency he went up into the farm country in Kansas and Minnesota and made a farm speech. On September 6, 1952, he said he was "a 90 percent parity man with no ifs and buts." I want you to know exactly what President Eisenhower said in this speech in 1952—and this is exactly what he said—I quote:

And here and now without any ifs or buts I say to you that the Republican Party stands behind the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic Farm Act passed by the voters of both parties in Congress to continue through 1954 the price support on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. All I know of farmers convinces me that they would rather earn their fair share than to have it as a Government handout, and a fair share is not only 90 percent parity, but is full parity.

But once the Republicans were in office their promises were forgotten. President Eisenhower's administration did away with 90 percent supports for the farmer. In its place was substituted something called the sliding scale. Farmers have been sliding down that scale ever since. The Republicans claimed that his sliding scale would do away with agricultural surplus. They said it was the way to get the farmers' income up—doing away with surpluses at the same time. That was their theory. The crop surpluses we have today are largely built up under the Republican administration. They cannot deny this.

Take wheat, for instance. The day before the Eisenhower administration took office we had enough surplus wheat on hand to last us less than 6 months. On the last day of 1955 we had enough wheat to last us more than a year. We had more than twice as much surplus corn and 12 times as much cotton as we had when this administration took office. Prices dropped, even on the farm products for which there was no Government surplus. Between January 1953 and January 1956 beef cattle prices fell 30 percent, and hog prices dropped 40 percent. In 1952 the average hog sold for \$42. On March 15, 1956, the average hog sold for \$29. In 1952 beef cattle sold for an average of \$228 per head. In March 1956 the price was \$135 a head. The farmer had lost \$13 on hogs and \$93 a head on beef cattle. Hogs and cattle are not supported at 90 percent of parity, but they, too, share in the farm decline. That is why the Congress wanted to go back to the 90 percent of parity. It worked in the past and will work again.

The President has completely abandoned the flexible supports, his sliding scale. The very day that he vetoed our farm bill, because it provided for 90-percent of parity he departed from the slid-

ing scale and gave the farmer 82½ percent for cotton, 83 percent for rice, 84 percent for wheat, and 86 percent for corn. And he put into effect the same price support on milk and butterfat, which he had criticized the Congress for passing.

If the past is any guide to the future, I predict that should the Republicans be successful in this election, we will be back to the 75 percent of parity level next year. The Democrats feel that price-support programs should be consistent. They believe the programs should be such as to enable the farmer to plan his operations in election, as well as nonelection years. The administration promised 90 percent of parity in the last election year, but has since devised every conceivable means to grant farmers less than 90 percent of parity.

#### THE COST TO THE FARMER OF THE INCONSISTENCY OF THE REPUBLICAN FARM PROGRAMS

President Eisenhower's veto cost the farmer \$2 billion for this year. The farmers' income in the last 3 years of the Republican administration has dropped from \$15 billion to \$11 billion. Corporation profits have increased 35 percent since 1952. Dividends are up 24 percent; landlords get 17 percent more; wages are up 13 percent. The farmer is not opposed to such splendid gains. He just wants to share them. But the farmer has not gained. His income has gone down more than 26 percent. The country prospers and the farmer goes deeper and deeper into debt. At the end of 1952 the total farm debt stood at \$6,588 million. As of the end of 1955, it was \$8,176 million—an increase of almost \$2 billion.

The farm bill and the Presidential veto are only one chapter in the Democratic Party's fight for the farmer. We will fight for a more favorable credit for the farmer. We will fight to keep his interest rates low. And I promise you, my friends, to fight—with renewed determination—for 90 percent of parity. We will fight to stop this decline in farm income—and I predict that we will win.

#### THE SOIL-BANK PROGRAM

The soil bank was not a new idea of this administration. We have known for a long time that the cure for surpluses was to reduce crop acreage. But, if the farmer lets acreage lie idle he does not get any income from those acres. Under the soil bank plan the Government will pay the farmer to reduce his acreage of commodities which are now in surplus supply. Thus, the farmer will receive an income even though he does not plant these acres with crops to be harvested.

The Democratic Congress has favored this type of program for years. Since 1954 the President's Secretary of Agriculture has been calling the idea unworkable. It seems that a lot of things are workable in election years that do not work in other years. If the President had really wanted a soil-bank program he could have used the power already in existence under the provisions of the Soil Conservation Act of 1935. He now has the new soil-bank provisions and \$1.2 billion with which to carry out its provisions but this will be of practically no

benefit to the farmer this year. It is a case of too little, too late.

#### THE REPUBLICANS AND DEPRESSIONS

The first farm depression came to the United States under President Harding. The second depression came under President Hoover. The Republican Party is now pushing us into a third farm depression. This happens because of the basic differences between the aims and objectives of the two parties. The Democrats are concerned about the individual. The Republicans forget the individual and worry only about economizing. Since 1952 the farmer has been on the economic downgrade. The harder he has worked the deeper he has gone into debt. As I have indicated earlier, if the farmer does not prosper, you will not.

The Democratic Party is the party of many interests. Under its great tent gather people from different regions and people from different ways of life. No one interest can dominate, but all must have their rightful day in court. Today the farmer, faced with declining income, needs his day in court, not only for the farmers' good, but for the good of all.

In the days ahead, I hope that all of you—those of you who live in our big cities, in our large towns, on our broad prairies and our fertile fields, farms, and ranches—will give thoughtful consideration to the plight of the farmer and what each of us must do to protect him, and to protect our great economy.

#### A DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1956, the American people heard, from 19 Members of the Senate of the United States and 77 Members of the House of Representatives, through the agency of Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, a declaration of constitutional principles. With the exception of a few members, the congressional delegations of 11 Southern States signed the statement.

What did they so declare?

These signatory members declared to the Senate, the Congress, the Nation, and the world:

We regard the decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power.

They drew the shield of the Constitution about them to protect them from a decision of the Court established by that Constitution to uphold and preserve the great principles of the Government of the United States of America. Because—they say—education is not mentioned in the text of the Constitution, the Supreme Court has no right to consider any question respecting it.

In the matter of desegregated schools, the facts have been with us for a long time. It was thought, by the adoption

of the Fourteenth Amendment, that a method of handling these facts had been given to the Nation within the framework of the Constitution. In fact, in the school case of May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court invoked this amendment and particularly the "equal protection of the laws" clause contained therein, as the basis for prohibiting any further action on the part of the States to maintain segregated schools.

The declaration is a grave matter. In the background, and, as it were, conjoined to it, are the resolutions passed by the legislatures of 5 of these 11 States, holding that the Supreme Court has trespassed on the reserved powers of the States. And behind both the declaration and the resolutions is a sharp echo of nullification, the political doctrine at large just a short century ago in the days preceding the Civil War.

In contrast to these dark portents is the fact that these Senators and Representatives have also solemnly stated:

We pledge ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation.

This declaration is an incredibly important incident in our national life. The stresses that brought up to the Civil War of a century ago are still subsistent and still have the same potential explosive force they did then. A nation may survive one civil war successfully, but it can never afford the "luxury" of another.

#### THE NEGRO AND EQUAL RIGHTS

When the Constitution was adopted, over a century and a half ago, the right to own Negroes as property was existent in all the Thirteen Colonies, but was little exercised except in those from Maryland south. We also had indentured servants, but these, once they either earned or worked their way out of service, both of which things they were free to do, became free citizens and merged readily with the totality of citizens of the Nation. Negroes, however, even when emancipated, either through some efforts of their own or through the generosity of their masters, continued under the stigma of their former servitude. Why? Because the Negroes, who were on the far side of the pigmentation chart from the Anglo-Saxon whites among whom they worked, were easy to differentiate by a color contrast. It was practically forgotten that these were people with the normal complement of ears and eyes, hands and feet, emotions, and intellects. Practically forgotten, but not quite.

Even in the Constitutional Convention there were lingering questions as how to handle the Negro question. Mr. Wilson, it is reported, "did not well see on what principle the proportion of three-fifths could be explained. Are they admitted as citizens? Then why are they not admitted on an equality with white citizens? Are they admitted as property? Then why is not other property admitted into computation?" Gouverneur Morris declared that reduced as he was to the dilemma of doing injustice to the Southern States, or to human nature, he found that he must do it to the former. Luther Martin of Maryland explained why the

clauses respecting the three-fifths computation and the prohibition on importation of slaves were adopted after all:

I found the eastern States, notwithstanding their aversion to slavery, were very willing to indulge the southern States, at least with a temporary liberty to prosecute the slave trade, provided the southern States would in their turn, gratify them, by laying no restriction on navigation acts.

He followed this statement with an impassioned oration that—

We had appealed to the Supreme Being for his assistance as the God of freedom \* \* \* [and] now, when we scarcely had risen from our knees, from supplicating his aid and protection, in forming our government over a free people \* \* \* to have a provision not only putting it out of its power to restrain and prevent the slave trade, but even encouraging the most infamous traffic by giving the States power and influence in the Union in proportion as they cruelly and wantonly sport with the rights of their fellow creatures, ought to be considered as a solemn mockery of, and insult to that God whose protection we had then implored.

As you read the records of the convention, you find that the general tenor of thought was that only Georgia and South Carolina needed great numbers of slaves, and these for their rice fields. The facts of history turned this picture upside down. The cotton gin brought a new economic value to the Negro slave, and the great economic rise of the slave-owning cotton States began. The original unhappy compromise was followed by a series of equally unworkable compromises, the Missouri Compromise, and the Kansas-Nebraska Act. There were also counter proposals such as the Wilmot Proviso. The long 60 years ended in the Civil War and the freeing of the slaves.

But the mood of compromise did not end there. Although the Congress after the conclusion of the war set out immediately to insure the protection of the freedom and rights of the Negro, his newly found freedom traveled a rocky road in the courts.

In 1865, the Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing slavery, was ratified. In 1866, the Congress passed the first of the Civil Rights Acts, making it a misdemeanor to deprive any person or inhabitant, under color of law, of any of the political rights mentioned therein. In 1866 the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified, which outlawed discrimination by the States in principle. In 1868 the Fifteenth Amendment, protecting the right of suffrage from discriminatory action because of race or color, was ratified. All of these are still in effect.

In 1875, the second Civil Rights Act was passed, prohibiting discrimination by any person against any citizen with respect to accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of amusement. This law was immediately challenged in a series of cases, all of them decided together by the Supreme Court in 1883 under the name civil-rights cases. The Court held that the Congress had no right to pass such legislation, since the Fourteenth Amendment was prohibitory only on action by the States. They drew

a parallel between the prohibitory power of the amendment and the impairment of contract clause, holding that the power given the courts by the Judiciary Act of 1798 to "review final decisions of State courts, whenever they should be repugnant to the Constitution or laws of the United States" was the remedy in this situation, not an act of Congress.

When, however, a discriminatory State law did come up before the Court in *Plessy versus Ferguson*, in 1896, the Court, although it stated that the object of the Fourteenth Amendment was "undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law," took refuge in the "separate but equal" doctrine, which it based on the Massachusetts decision of 1849 in *Roberts versus City of Boston*, making it compatible with the uniformity of regulation that best assists interstate commerce. Mr. Justice Harlan, who fought the good fight to the last in all these cases, dissented, stating:

In respect to civil rights, common to all citizens, the Constitution of the United States does not, I think, permit any public authority to know the race of these entitled to be protected in the enjoyment of such rights.

He said further:

The fundamental objection, therefore, to the statute is that it interferes with the personal freedom of citizens.

He ended:

In view of the Constitution, in the eye of the law, there is in this country no superior, dominant ruling class of citizens. There is no caste here. Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens.

In 1917, in the face of a contention by the defense counsel that *Plessy versus Ferguson* was controlling, the Court held in *Buchanan versus Warley* that an ordinance of the city of Louisville prohibiting sales of residential property to Negroes in blocks containing a majority of whites, and vice versa, was in direct violation of the Fourteenth Amendment preventing State interference with property rights except by due process of law.

In 1946, a State law within the scope of the separate but equal doctrine of *Plessy versus Ferguson* was held inapplicable to interstate carriage by rail in *Morgan versus Virginia*.

In 1948 came what has been called the new rule in *Shelley's case*, when the Supreme Court held that while the making of racially restrictive covenants was not prohibited by the 14th amendment, it was a real violation of the "equal protection" clause for State courts to enforce them.

#### THE QUESTION OF THE SCHOOLS

The Senators and the Representatives from the South have stressed the fact that—

The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the Fourteenth Amendment nor any other amendment.

We can ask them quite simply: Why should it be mentioned?

The States themselves had not assumed the responsibility of education at the time of the Constitution. The New England States had, for the most part, schools supported by the townships, the



closest approach then extant to the public-school concept, although their roots in church schools are seen in the fact that the local minister was still an official visitant; the Middle States most frequently had church related schools; and the Southern States, for the most part, relied on private tutoring for children of the wealthier classes, and did little if anything for the poorer classes.

It was not until 1825 that it may be said to have been clearly recognized by thinking men that the only safe reliance of a system of State schools lay in the general and direct taxation of all property for their support. Concomitant with this rise in the public character of the schools was the diversity of opinion between those preferring centralization—meaning State control—and those in favor of local administration. This problem resulted in a working compromise at the beginning of the 20th century whereby the local school boards had charge of details, such as teacher hiring, and the States set the broad qualification standards, such as teacher training requirements. In the 50 years since then, the Congress has shown a willingness to share the responsibility for the school systems with the other two layers of control. It has, in the slight instances in which laws have been passed regarding it, erected a further effective compromise through certain Federal aids to education.

Surely, the Constitution is, and was intended to be, adaptable to the various social structures, such as public education, which the advancing times have brought into existence. The framers of that great document were planning not for their day alone, but for a future with unknown possibilities. In the debate on the Tenth Amendment, James Madison stated:

There must necessarily be admitted powers by implication unless the Constitution descended to recount every minutiae.

Considering, now, the question of the Supreme Court and the theory of segregated education, we find that the Court never once made that theory the basis of a decision respecting the schools. There have been decisions of lower Federal courts and State supreme courts which did so; but in the Supreme Court, on such occasions as it was mentioned with approval, it was within dictum of certain cases. And as early as 1908, the Court, by implication, questioned whether it could be approved as consistent with the guaranty of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The first instance in which the theory was mentioned by the Supreme Court was in 1877 in the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Clifford in *Hall versus DeCuir*. This very case, together with *Plessy versus Ferguson*, was reversed by the decision in *Morgan versus Virginia* in 1946.

In *Plessy versus Ferguson*, relied on by the gentlemen from the South, the separate but equal doctrine was applied to travel in interstate commerce, and during the course of the opinion, the State school segregation theory was recited with approval. The decision itself, however, turned on the question of

a burden on interstate commerce, not on segregation in education. The remarks concerning education were purely illustrative.

When in 1899, in *Cumming versus Board of Education*, the Court considered a question of separate schools for separate races, it expressly excluded from its consideration the validity of the statutes providing for racial segregation, and went ahead with its decision without referring to the Fourteenth Amendment.

In 1908, in the *Berea College* case, where the State contested the right of the college to conduct an integrated school, the Court stated that a "corporation is not entitled to all the immunities to which individuals are entitled" and distinctly presaged its action in the decision of May 17, 1954, with the following statement:

Such a statute [Kentucky's compulsory school segregation act of 1904] may conflict with the Federal Constitution in denying to individuals powers which they may rightfully exercise, and yet, at the same time, be valid as to a corporation created by the State.

In the *Gong Lum* case in 1927, although the Court upheld the right of the local school board in an area of segregated schools to assign a Chinese student to the Negro instead of the white school as within the equal protection clause, it did so in reliance on its 1899 decision, which had not really decided the issue. Moreover, the facts show that the plaintiff did not question segregation in the schools, but merely wanted his daughter assigned to the white instead of the Negro school. The Court again assumed rather than decided the question.

The higher education cases which have arisen in the last 10 years have found the Court scrutinizing the facts much more carefully than in the earlier cases. Thus we find in *Missouri ex rel Gaines versus Canada* and in the *Sipuel* case, the Court decided that no student should be compelled to leave his State in order to get advanced education, but it did not controvert the concept that the State could, if it wished, erect a separate graduate school to supply the training. In *Sweatt versus Painter*, its glance at the situation was even sharper, and it held that the student could not possibly acquire the same professional proficiency in a newly established totally segregated school. Both the lack of accreditation and lack of access to the most renowned professors, and the lack of a normal body of acceptable students interested in the same type of education, militated against the Negro student's profiting to the maximum from his training.

And so we come to the case in 1954 which requires integration, in as reasonable a time as possible, in all the public schools. The concept negatively expressed in the *Berea College* case, that the individual's right to equal opportunity to education in unsegregated schools was within the "equal protection clause" may be within the purview of the Fourteenth Amendment; and the further concept expressed in the lucid analogy propounded by the Court in the *Civil Rights*

case in 1883, that "the remedy which Congress actually provided was that giving the Supreme Court of the United States jurisdiction to review final decisions of State courts whenever they should sustain the validity of a State statute or authority alleged to be repugnant to the Constitution or laws of the United States" were fused into an epochmaking decision in behalf of the freedom of the individual, protecting and sustaining the rights of all citizens under the Constitution.

#### THE RIGHT OF THE COURT TO ADVANCE WITH THE TIMES

I shall not say too much on this point, but would like to point out that the Constitution is adaptable to changing times. I might also add that it is due to that adaptability that we have—although we seldom realize it—the oldest written Constitution under which a government is still actively functioning in the world.

Justice Stone once said:

In determining whether a provision of the Constitution applies to a new subject matter, it is of little significance that it is one with which the framers were not familiar. For in setting up an enduring framework of government they undertook to carry out for the indefinite future, and in all the vicissitudes of the changing affairs of men, those fundamental purposes which the instrument itself discloses. Hence we read its words, not as we read legislative codes which are subject to continuous revision with the changing course of events, but as the revelation of the great purposes which we intended to be achieved by the Constitution as a continuing instrument of government.

And thus, about the same period that all these civil rights cases were coming to the courts, various cases under the Interstate Commerce Act were being decided, such as the *Addyston Pipe and Steel* case in 1899 which upheld the *Sherman Act*; the Minnesota rate cases of 1913 which held that State powers which affect interstate commerce may do so only incidentally and indirectly; and the 1937 case of *West Coast Hotel Co. versus Parrish* which upheld a State minimum wage law, holding it not a breach of freedom of contract. None of these ideas would have been within the purview of the framers of the Constitution, who did not dream of industrial combinations, extensive State taxation or other regulation of commerce; or in those days when the employers did all the dictating as to wages, that the State had any right to set a minimum wage of any sort.

#### CONCLUSION

Neither these gentlemen from the South nor any other persons can say that the court has substituted naked judicial power and personal political and social ideas for the established law of the land.

In the first place, as I have demonstrated in my comment on the civil rights cases, the power was given the court as far back as the Judiciary Act of 1798, to render an opinion in these premises. And it has, with restraint and justice, only carried out the great tasks that the oaths of the individual justices require them to carry out—the upholding of the Constitution of the United States and the rendition of equal justice under the law.

As for these concepts being personal political and social ideas, so long as the Constitution is adaptable to the new forces of life which spring up from age to age, these judges have done no more than carry forward the great principles of equality and justice into the present day. In the Boston school case, Mr. Sumner, who argued the brief for plaintiff said justly: "A public school, by definition, was for the benefit of all classes meeting together on terms of equality."

In the 1948 report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, entitled "Education for American Democracy," this idea is developed further:

If education is to make the attainment of a more perfect democracy one of its major goals, it is imperative that it extend its benefits to all on equal terms. We must renounce the practices of discrimination and segregation in educational institutions as contrary to the spirit of democracy. Education leaders and institutions should take positive steps to overcome the conditions which at present obstruct free and equal access to educational opportunities. Educational programs everywhere should be aimed at undermining and eventually limiting the attitudes that are responsible for discrimination and segregation—at creating instead attitudes that will make education freely available to all.

The Court did not ask immediate desegregation. It asked only that as plans were worked out that would be effective they be put into effect. But the desegregation case is a real benchmark in the onward march of true democracy. No longer can we say that the Court has not spoken; that the States may go on as they have in the past; that things that are equal but separate are also equal and identical.

The United States is committed to its destiny; to be and to demonstrate the ideal of a God-fearing democratic nation in the eyes of the whole world.

Fulfilling this destiny is a matter which has now taken on even more widespread ramifications than those of moral imperative and democratic tradition. It may now well be a condition for the survival of freedom in many parts of the world. The totalitarian rulers of the Soviet Union have carefully exploited the issue of segregation and discrimination in the United States and will continue to be successful in doing so as long as glaring examples of inequality actually exist in the United States and are not simply figments of Soviet propaganda.

A graphic demonstration of this fact came to my attention quite recently. An adolescent girl who only some weeks ago emerged from behind the Iron Curtain was in my office. I asked her many questions about the educational system behind the curtain and got the usual answers about the emphasis on the glorification of Lenin and theories of Soviet communism. I then asked her what was the first thing that came to her mind when she was asked what she had learned about the United States in the Czechoslovakian school she had attended. Without hesitation, her answer was, "You don't treat the colored people the same as you treat the whites." She then recited in detail the history of the Auerhine Lucy case.

The only way we can successfully meet this Soviet propaganda abroad is to face the facts of discrimination and segregation at home and act to put our house in order. This is not an easy task, nor can it be accomplished instantaneously. Continuous progress is essential, however; retrogression could be seriously damaging. The Supreme Court decision did not insist on immediate compliance; it asked that plans for gradual compliance be inaugurated. This decision, coming 86 years after ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment and 84 years after ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment, is not unreasonable from a practical point of view. It is clearly in accord with the basic constitutional guaranties and must be complied with in spirit as well as letter, if the true promise of equal opportunity for all, set out in the Constitution, is to be meaningful to all—regardless of race or creed.

#### STATEMENT ON AMENDMENT TO THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, since the act of June 10, 1922, dependents of members of the uniformed services have been reimbursed, or otherwise provided transportation, when the member has been ordered to make a permanent change of duty station. Currently, such authority for payment of travel expenses is authorized in the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Not only must there be a change in permanent duty station and not only must the dependent have performed the travel for which they seek reimbursement, but, the Comptroller General has additionally ruled, the travel must have been incident to the establishment of permanent residence.

It is frequently the practice of dependents of members of the naval service to return to family homes in the Midwest when their husbands go to sea. After a separation of many months, these families quite naturally want to return to the home port when the ship comes in and the serviceman is to receive orders to a shore duty station. Under these conditions, the dependents, unless they have a permanent residence in the home port, are not eligible for reimbursement for travel expenses to the new permanent duty station. The imposition of the additional requirement that there be a permanent residence is, I believe, superfluous and is not in keeping with the legislative intent of the Career Compensation Act.

Thus I have today introduced a bill which would clearly and unequivocally establish as a basis for reimbursement requirements that there be a permanent change of station and that the dependents' travel, for which reimbursement is sought, is performed, but without regard to permanent change of residence. Pas-

sage of this legislation will, I believe, leave no doubt in the minds of these service families as to the attitude of the Congress toward travel of this type.

#### VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, very recently a bill was reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs granting certain benefits, pensions, and compensation to our veterans. I believe it will come up under a privileged resolution. I hope it will be taken up at the very earliest moment because, as I understand, the House is likely to adjourn about the middle of July. If this bill is not passed quickly, I fear the other body may not act.

#### SENT \$1.5 BILLION SURPLUS BACK TO STATES FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks there has been a great deal of speculation and suggestion as to what should be done with the estimated \$2 billion Treasury surplus anticipated for this fiscal year. I can well understand the reason for so much comment, because the novelty of having a budget surplus is a rarity to most of us.

However, if we turn the pages back far enough, all the way back to 1836, history shows that our predecessors in Congress had a similar problem at that time.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, despite the absence of economic and excise taxes our young American Nation found, much to its dismay, that the Treasury would yield some \$40 million in surplus at the end of 1836. As a result, troubled and indignant Congressmen took the floor warning against this "evil" and pleaded the necessity of an immediate reduction. They felt, to use the words of one legislator, "that the reduction would be a less evil than that extraordinary and dangerous state of things, in which the United States should be found laying and collecting taxes for the purposes of distributing them among the States of the Union."

It would be interesting to note the reaction of these legislators to many of our subsequent Federal-assistance programs, despite my firm conviction that our great country has developed and prospers under most legislation of this nature.

But to return to this surplus of 1836, I have noted with interest that Congress passed an act ordering the distribution of this anticipated surplus, namely, \$37,468,859.47, to the several States according to their respective numbers of Representatives in Congress. The sum finally amounted to \$28,101,645, paid to 27 States.



Although the aim of this distribution was primarily to reduce the surplus, many States used the money to support local education. I include for the record, a chart showing this distribution and the use made of the grant by individual

States. It is taken from the United States Office of Education, History of Federal and State Aid to Higher Education, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1890, LC 173.B6:

	Number of electors	Amount received	Objects to which applied
Alabama.....	7	\$669,086.78	Education.
Arkansas.....	3	286,751.48	General purposes.
Connecticut.....	8	764,670.61	Education one-half, general purposes one-half.
Delaware.....	3	286,751.48	Education.
Florida.....			
Georgia.....	11	1,051,422.09	One-third education, two-thirds general purposes.
Illinois.....	5	477,919.13	Education and internal improvements.
Indiana.....	9	800,254.44	One-half education, one-half general purposes.
Kentucky.....	15	1,443,757.40	Education.
Louisiana.....	5	477,919.13	General purposes.
Maine.....	10	955,838.27	Do.
Massachusetts.....	14	1,338,173.57	Do.
Maryland.....	10	955,838.27	Education and general purposes.
Mississippi.....	4	382,335.31	General purposes.
Missouri.....	4	382,335.31	Education.
Michigan.....	3	286,751.48	Internal improvements.
New Hampshire.....	7	669,086.78	General purposes.
New Jersey.....	8	764,670.61	Do.
New York.....	42	4,014,520.71	Education.
North Carolina.....	15	1,433,757.40	Education in part, internal improvements.
Ohio.....	21	2,007,260.36	Education.
Pennsylvania.....	30	2,867,514.80	Education in part.
Rhode Island.....	4	382,335.31	Education.
South Carolina.....	11	1,051,422.09	Education one-third, general purposes two-thirds.
Tennessee.....	15	1,433,757.40	General purposes.
Vermont.....	7	669,086.78	Education.
Virginia.....	23	2,198,428.04	General purposes.

My own State of Connecticut used half its share for education and the other half for general purposes.

Regarding the money used for Connecticut education, a very unique town deposit fund was set up and is still in operation today. Under this system, each Connecticut town received a proportionate share of the \$380,000 based on a population census, which fund was entrusted to a town custodian. The custodian is essentially a trustee for the corpus of the fund and must appropriate the entire annual income for the support of public schools. The corpus may be used as a loan fund but the money must be repaid within a year, or the town must forfeit a like sum to the State. The custodian, who is usually the town treasurer, has a duty to manage the fund wisely, and may invest, but must make annual reports to the State treasurer.

And so, in a sense, we have today, a situation similar to 1836, namely, a treasury surplus and a need for educational improvements. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, what I propose is that the surplus, not all of it, but approximating the amount deemed necessary for school construction by the House Education and Labor Committee, be utilized as a direct "one shot in the arm" grant to the States for the sole purpose of constructing local schools.

Based on the type of administrative machinery created in 1836, I can see no reason why Federal aid could not be extended to public education. Clearly such a system of financial assistance would eliminate a popular criticism, that is, excessive Federal control. True, there are difficulties in a plan of this nature and although lack of time prevents the exhaustive discussion of them, here are a few:

Opponents of this plan may claim the bill would defeat the present aim to equalize national education because if distribution were made according to con-

gressional representation, the States with larger populations would benefit more, and those are the States with the best school systems. But this disadvantage could be remedied by setting up some equitable standard of allocations to the States needing aid more critically.

Another contention: Since not all the States set up town deposit funds, as did Connecticut in 1836, the bill could not utilize the administrative framework. But the town deposit method could be set out and integrated in the bill, thus making it mandatory for each State to establish before the money is granted. There would be variations, since the Western States have differently controlled school systems.

Many will claim the surplus is mainly a result of money paid in by the individual taxpayer, and should be accordingly refunded since every taxpayer will not directly benefit by the construction of schools. But, although every taxpayer will not directly benefit, education furthers the progress of the entire Nation, including every citizen whose obligation it is to lend reasonable support. I am sure every citizen realizes this, and would be willing to support education in this manner.

Naturally, the element of Federal control superseding the existing local control over school systems is a main issue. The question is: How much supervision will the Federal Government retain in order to insure wise spending of the money? Of course, this is a procedural question and is relative to many factors. But based on the precedent of the act of 1836, I see no reason why funds could not be given directly to the States without strings, so long as they are used for school construction.

As it now stands, the Federal-aid bill grants \$400 million a year for school construction and allocates this money to the States according to the number of schoolchildren, that is, 5 to 17 years.

There are many among us who find it confusing and unacceptable without material alterations.

Admittedly, there are apparent mechanical difficulties in my proposal but the success of a workable solution to the Nation's educational plight insists on exhaustive but expeditious examination into all possible avenues of approach.

#### SPECIAL ORDER POSTPONED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated and that I be given permission to address the House for the same length of time on tomorrow following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAILEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### THE MICHIGAN DECLARATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, in Grand Rapids, Mich., the Democratic Party of the State of Michigan in formal convention assembled, deliberated upon and adopted the Michigan Declaration, a statement of fundamental principles and political goals. Although, by the nature of its origin, it is addressed first to the Democratic Party throughout the Nation, it is in fact written for all who have faith in democracy because it is a renewal of the spirit of America, and a militant call to action. Every American who is seriously concerned with the great turmoil of the times in which we live will recognize it as a spark that ought to start a fire in the hearts of men and women everywhere concerning a new realism about human values in worldwide economic, social, political, and spiritual relations. The pronouncements of the declaration reassert the Christian doctrines and constitutional mandates which undergird the greatness of America and ought to result in a rekindling of the zeal and resourcefulness of a great people in resolving their own problems and then reaching beyond to progress.

The Michigan Declaration is a 20th century emancipation proclamation for the entire American people. It covers foreign policy, segregation, civil rights, civil liberty, labor policy, atomic energy, automation, economic policy, agriculture, natural resources, health, education, and social security. It is a vitalized political philosophy whose diligent application can hasten us toward goals of justice, peace, and harmony, releasing Americans from the many inequities which shackle opportunities and fulfillment of needs for the family farmer, labor, minority, and other groups.

Already this statement has provoked wide comment across the Nation. We think: the Democratic Members of Congress from Michigan think it is a great document, worthy of a great political

party. It is a credo for today which we hope every American, North and South, East and West, will read well and ponder its meaning to our time. We therefore are proud to present the text of the declaration:

#### THE MICHIGAN DECLARATION

The Democratic Party of Michigan, in convention assembled on this June 2, 1956, declares its belief that the world is embroiled in total revolutions of great peril or promise in the affairs of men and of nations. In the true tradition of the Democratic Party, we issue a call and a challenge to meet these total revolutions with zeal, courage, and vision, with bold programs adequate to the opportunity and the need, with policies firmly based on unchanging principles of moral law.

We urge the Democratic Party in the several States and in its national entity, through the national platform we will adopt in August and through the voices of its leaders everywhere, to reject complacency and to relight with living thoughts and burning words the zeal and ardor of the American people for great accomplishments.

The mission of the Democratic Party, as the people's party, is to assess and report the needs and aspirations of the people and to be their instrument to achieve the greater tomorrows of true peace and real prosperity possible for all mankind.

The revolutions of peril and promise of which we speak are these:

The revolution of atomic energy, which, if harnessed to the benefit of all peoples, can furnish the means of achieving a goal sought by mankind from the beginning of time, namely, the end of degrading poverty and inhuman drudgery for all people everywhere.

The revolution of automation, by which material goods can be made in quantities inconceivable, and the leisure of workers to enjoy the fruits of their labor increased many fold. Through mechanization of farms, and greater seed and animal yield, food and fiber for all mankind can now be produced.

The revolution in the weapons of war. The annihilation of whole nations is possible with the weapons of today. Total war means total disaster for all contenders, aggressor and defender alike.

The revolution of anticolonialism. Since World War II millions of people have emerged or are emerging from colonial domination into national freedom. The course of history depends on whether these nations develop in the democratic philosophy of the dignity of man as created by God.

The revolution of conquest by Soviet imperialism, under which subjugated peoples from Czechoslovakia to China groan in misery and servitude. The industrialization and militarization of China under Soviet control is radically tilting the balance of power against the Western World.

The revolution of atheistic communism, an ideology which seeks the destruction of religion, the subversion of democracy by internal conspiracy and the conquest of the whole world.

The revolution of integration, as the evil pattern of segregation yields to the hammer blows of justice. This generation of Americans can and shall see the day when segregation in practice is as rare as human slavery, and as promptly prosecuted in due process of law.

The revolution of time and space, by which communications and travel have shrunk the world to such size that all men are neighbors.

The peril or promise of these revolutions cannot be met by part-time administration of half-way programs under indifferent leadership with lukewarm concern for the needs of the people.

The national Republican administration feeds Americans an opiate of complacency in these times of vast scientific and ideological turmoil. It commits a psychological betrayal of the people by not informing them of the true nature of events.

The national Republican administration has no sense of mission in world affairs, no sense of urgency in meeting the vast scientific and technological changes rolling on us, no sense of a call to greatness for the people.

Under the Republican national administration, workers are unemployed, the family farms go bankrupt, small business is depressed, public power programs wither, conservation policies are sabotaged, the aged are neglected, the education of our youth is frustrated by inadequate facilities and severe shortage of teachers, national highways are paralyzed with traffic, health needs are given lipservice, slum housing is tolerant, and from Tripoli to Shanghai peoples are in turmoil as American leadership of the free world falters.

America needs, and in her heart she wants, the fervor of our forefathers to meet the awesome challenge of a world teetering between a golden age of brotherhood and freedom on one side, and on the other, the dark night of Communist tyranny.

So long as one human being is hungry and we can feed him and do not, so long as one person is naked and we can clothe him and do not, so long as one person is sick and we can minister to him and do not, so long as one worker or farmer is deprived of a just living and we can remedy it and do not, so long as one person is unwillingly illiterate and we can educate him and do not, so long as one nation is subjugated by another against its will and we can work for freedom and do not, the American task is not done.

This Michigan declaration therefore asserts certain principles which we believe can guide the people through the perils and promise of the revolutions about us to the end of justice, freedom and peace for all mankind. Among these principles are:

1. God established the nature of man in wondrous dignity. This dignity is inherent in man and gives him certain rights—to life, to freedom, to the pursuit of happiness, rights independent of race, color, creed or national origins. These rights include ownership of property, justice under law, and the individual's right to a virtuous reputation among his fellow men unless he by specific action forfeits it. These rights apply every place in the world. They are not given by the State nor by society, and neither the State nor society can in justice take them away.

2. Man is his brother's keeper, responsible for the welfare of his fellow man to the limit of his ability.

3. The proper role of government, as Abraham Lincoln said, is to do for the people those things needing to be done which the people cannot do at all, or do as well for themselves. Conversely, government should leave to other associations of people, associations of labor and management, for example, or of consumers, and to individuals, those things which the people concerned can better do for themselves.

4. Communism and all other forms of totalitarian suppression are intrinsically evil and cannot be made right by historical or current circumstance.

5. The goods of the earth belong to the peoples of the earth. Neither any man nor any nation has the right to exploit the goods of the earth solely to his or its own aggrandizement.

6. The right of nations to democratic national existence, independence and self-determination shall be recognized by the United States, while concurrently we work ceaselessly to strengthen the United Nations, and to increase its influence and power to act.

7. A political or social policy of segregation is evil and is not made morally right by circumstances.

8. The fulfillment of man's rights requires civil order; civil order requires obedience to law; the decisions of the United States Supreme Court are the law of the United States, unless changed in proper process. The clear words of Gov. G. Mennen Williams precisely express this point:

"In our Democratic philosophy, the ringing words of the Declaration of Independence are more than pretty phrases. All men are created equal, are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. We can have no part of the corrosive doctrine that any American, rich or poor, colored or white, native-born or naturalized, north or south, east or west—can be one whit less than a full citizen. . . ."

"We know that this is an ideal toward which we strive, not a condition which we enjoy. But this idea can never be realized unless we stand unrelentingly for the principles that the Constitution must be the law of the land, everywhere in the land; that no part of the Nation may be permitted to say it is not the law for them; that the President may not ignore enforcement, nor Congress support evasion."

On the foundation of these principles, and in the light of the great revolutionary changes for good or for evil apparent about us, we declare that the Democratic Party should assert bold, aggressive leadership through its national platform, and through the voices of its leaders to achieve these ends in these areas:

#### FOREIGN POLICY

The moral leadership of the Democratic Presidents of this century, from the fourteen points of Wilson and the four freedoms of Roosevelt to the point 4 program of Truman, gave new hope for the better life to the people of every land. We need now a forceful and meaningful reaffirmation of the great truths of our Declaration of Independence and of our Bill of Rights. Freedom, material sufficiency, and government by law for all peoples everywhere on earth should be the clear goal of our foreign policy.

#### SEGREGATION

The total elimination of segregation in the United States and the immediate end of discrimination in immigration.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

Full rights of citizenship without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, and immediate prosecution of any person who violates the civil rights of another any place in the land.

#### CIVIL LIBERTY

Protection of men and institutions against false smears and slanders; reaffirmation and support of the right of dissent, and of the right of the accused to face his accuser.

#### LABOR POLICY

The Republican philosophy expressed in the Taft-Hartley law that unions are barely to be tolerated shall be reversed and the growth of unions shall be encouraged to achieve equal bargaining power with management.

#### ATOMIC ENERGY

Since atomic energy was developed by the people at large through their Government, private exploitation of atomic energy shall be rigorously controlled in the public interest, and the incalculable potential of this power shall never be used for private advantage over public good. The export of atomic energy for peaceful use to underdeveloped nations of the world shall be energetically pursued.

#### AUTOMATION

For the welfare of all our people individually, and for the strength of the Nation, we welcome automation for the good that it can



do, and we believe government must facilitate the transition of industry and workers into an automated economy as rapidly as possible, and with the greatest possible protection against dislocation of individuals and business. The prodigious wealth of goods and services available through automation must be fairly distributed. A total review of all existing labor legislation, business legislation, and taxation should immediately be undertaken to assure to the people the advantages of the current revolution in energy and production.

#### ECONOMIC POLICY

Government has a dynamic responsibility to assist all the people to achieve the economic growth made possible by new science and skills and to see that there is equitable participation in that progress. In the expanding economy we anticipate, there is need for government to maintain competitive balance between business, labor, farmers, and consumers; between large enterprises, which are especially benefited by automation and atomic energy, and small ones; between areas benefiting from new developments and areas that may suffer disadvantages. We must protect small and independent business establishments against the crushing power of economic giantism. Tax policy needs to consider requirements for investment funds for new technical developments, the encouragement of small enterprises, and the purchasing power of consumers. The growth of industry will create great demands for credit, which, unless care is taken, will go to large enterprises and leave small ones at great competitive disadvantage. Expansion, taking place in waves, tends to create booms and subsequent recessions; government will need to supply the balance wheel to avoid both. Above all, we need a climate of opinion wherein growth is welcomed because there is assurance that there will be equitable participation in economic progress by every segment of the population.

#### AGRICULTURE

Competitive equality for the family farmer with the giant corporate farmer and programs to assure farmers of the opportunity to share in a rising standard of living. Recognition in farm policies of the unique nature of the farmer's risk and the need of others for his work in providing food and fiber.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES

The technological and power revolution requires planning for a century ahead in the development and conservation of natural resources. Protection of public domains, judicial use of mineral resources, and promotion of public power, flood control, irrigation, forest and soil conservation, public recreation, all must be geared to best judgments of a hundred years' needs.

#### HEALTH

Adequate hospital and medical care for everyone, for any illness, including mental illness, with the cost to be met by public and private insurance, supplemented by public reinsurance of disaster-type losses. Multifold increases in national expenditures for medical research, with particular attention to preventive medicine; expansion of medical training in all forms.

#### EDUCATION

Complete opportunity for every child to a full education commensurate with his ability at public expense in modern, safe schools staffed by teachers and administrators paid in proportion to the immense importance of their vocation. Federal aid to achieve this goal in any school district obeying the laws of the United States.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

The aged, persons unable to work because of illness or injury, widows and minor children shall be provided through private and

public insurance with adequate income to maintain their dignity as human beings, their health, and their opportunity to happiness and comfort. We assert that social-security programs are a proper function of Government and should be expanded in every aspect.

In conclusion, in this century the Democratic Party brought about fundamental reforms in the role of government in American life. These reforms were more than mere political stopgaps to meet emergencies; they were a peaceful revolution of everlasting consequence for this Nation and for the world. Among the many such reforms we cite these representative examples:

The concept that government has a deep responsibility in the social security of the people.

The concept of the Wagner Act, rightly called labor's Magna Carta, that free associations of workmen into unions should be encouraged as a national policy to the end that labor and management might bargain on equal footing.

The concept that the family farm must be protected against the impersonal workings of the market.

The concept that government has a fundamental responsibility to the people in maintaining and advancing a full economy with full employment.

The concept that isolationism is basically defective as a foreign policy and that the United States must participate in the world community of nations for the advancement of freedom and the protection of human rights throughout the world; and the concept of the United Nations as a means to achieve these ends.

The concept that public power development where needed is a proper and necessary responsibility for the Government in the name of all the people.

The concept that recessions and depressions must be remedied by prompt Government action in the name of the whole people.

Many young Americans have no personal memory of how comprehensive a turnabout of American policy these concepts represent. In each instance, the Republican Party worked under policies of exactly opposite concepts. In result, the United States experienced its worst economic depression; and in the world arena, the American voice was muted by the narrow, restrictive, selfish policy of Republican isolationism, expressed in actions ranging from withholding support for the League of Nations to gigantic tariff walls barring foreign trade.

The Democratic Party must renew the great concepts with which it is identified, protect them against betrayal and reversal, enlarge their scope to make Government grow in service to the people. And we must go further:

To a new foreign policy, based not on mere reaction to the changing masks of Soviet imperialism and communism, but based on dynamic application of our Declaration of Independence and of our Bill of Rights to all mankind, on the export of our freedom and of our moral principles.

To a regearing of economic policies and programs for the second industrial revolution of atomic energy and automation. "We are in the midst of the greatest scientific and technological revolution ever known," Governor Williams said in January. "The face . . . of our whole continent will be made over within the next few years—made over for good or for bad, depending entirely upon the vision and the courage with which we face up to the challenge which confronts us, the greatest challenge ever to face any people anywhere in all history."

To a full facing of the integration of peoples, in the United States and in the world, not only because morality requires it, though this be reason enough, but also because it is inseparably a part of achieving material progress and a just and lasting peace.

The choice lies "not in our stars but in ourselves" to fulfill our destiny.

"As God gives us to see the right" in Lincoln's words, let us rise to the great tasks yet undone. Let justice be our shield, freedom our garment, brotherhood our strength, and peace on earth and well-being of mankind our constant goal.

Adopted by the Democratic Party of Michigan, Democratic State convention, June 2, 1956, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the principles asserted by the Michigan declaration touch upon a number of subjects with which I have been very closely related. My work with the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives has made me particularly aware of the impact that the harnessing of the atom will have upon all of our lives.

Unfortunately, many people think our atomic-energy program is devoted principally to the design and production of weapons and military devices. While it is true that the military program has consumed the major portion of the expenditures to date, the Government has also spent sizable sums for the development of reactors for research and industrial uses; for physical research and for applications in biology and medicine. When I speak of sizable sums, I am talking about millions of dollars which even today is a large amount of money. By the end of this coming fiscal year, the Government will have spent in excess of \$15 billion for work with the atom.

This force, which this expenditure has produced, has already done much for us from the security standpoint. What it can do for us in the future defies imagination. There are miracles within our reach in medicine and science, production, and power. I am convinced that our investment will pay us off by giving us great medical and agricultural benefits and by revolutionizing industrial methods.

The contribution already made to health, one of the revolutions of promise, already has been tremendous. Brain tumors can be pinpointed by tracers, radio iodine arrests thyroid disorders, liver ailments can be detected and atom radiation curbs cancer. Atomic diagnosis has given hope to people with ailments once thought to be fatal. An intravenous injection of isotopes into a man's arm makes the functioning of the entire blood system visible. Though atomic science's contribution to our health has been great, there is no question but that it is in its infancy. Its future possibilities are immense.

Industry has already used radiation to toughen plastics, and tracers to help industrial efficiency by making measurements economically and quickly that once were costly and time consuming. Food preservation without refrigeration may soon be commonplace. Already it has been estimated that a billion dollars has been saved in the area of industrial use alone.

When or how soon economical atomic energy will be developed is not a question on which there is complete agreement.

There is nearly unanimous agreement that it is inevitable. We do have the comforting knowledge that if our coal and oil supplies are exhausted, we have a potential source of power that is practically limitless. We have the hope and a very reasonable one that a very cheap source of power is, in relative terms, just around the corner.

I personally am confident that we will have the wisdom to use for the benefit of all this law of nature which God has permitted us to discover. Surely He intended the unselfish to use it for the benefit of all.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I join with my Democratic colleague from Michigan [Mr. Diggs] in urging the Members of the House to seriously consider and approve the Michigan declaration of policy. It is based on forward-looking democratic principles and is designed to give our Nation a progressive program designed to produce true peace and real prosperity for our country and for all mankind.

Other Members from Michigan have or will comment on some of the many important features of this declaration. I would particularly like to call to the Members' attention the clear, forthright and indisputable position taken on the important problem of civil rights.

Segregation has been outlawed by the Supreme Court of the United States. Its decisions are the law of the land and there can be no legal or moral excuse for failure to abide by those laws unless and until they are changed through proper processes.

The Michigan declaration calls for action for restoration of the inalienable God-given rights of every individual "to life, to freedom, to the pursuit of happiness, rights independent of race, color, creed or national origin." Can anyone sincerely dispute that right?

Governor Williams, of Michigan, has said about this:

We know that this is an ideal toward which we strive, not a condition which we enjoy. But this idea can never be realized unless we stand unrelentingly for the principles that the Constitution must be the law of the land, everywhere in the land; that no part of the Nation may be permitted to say it is not the law for them; that the President may not ignore enforcement, nor Congress support evasion.

How can we in Congress justify our position if we fail to act on the civil-rights bill, H. R. 627, which has been voted out of the Judiciary Committee? That bill does not contain all the provisions needed to bring about all the progress that is needed in the field of civil rights. But it is a step in the right direction. It provides for a Commission on Civil Rights which would be empowered to investigate injustices. It provides for an additional assistant attorney general to take charge of civil-rights work and authorizes him to bring civil actions in Federal court to prevent or redress practices which violate civil-rights statutes.

On June 5, our colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has filed a dis-

charge petition which would in effect make it possible for the House to take a decisive vote on this legislation. I am happy to say that I have placed my signature as the second on that petition, immediately after that of Mr. ROOSEVELT.

I urge my colleagues, regardless of party, to sign that petition. This is our opportunity to demonstrate how sincere we are when we speak of our faith and adherence to the lofty principles of our Nation, whether we really do believe in equal rights for all. If we are to keep faith with the millions of Americans and with all the free people of the world who look to us for leadership, we should demonstrate our sincerity by action. This is the time for all true believers in civil rights to stand up and be counted.

Once again, I wish to state that I am proud of the fact that the Democratic Party in Michigan has, by adopting the Michigan declaration, demonstrated its adherence to all those principles which have made that party a great party and a party of the people.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the money and credit policy of the Federal Government plays a vital role in the economic health of the Nation. We are now witnessing the unfortunate effects of a wrong decision on credit policy by the Federal Reserve Board—a repeat performance of the hard-money policy that meant misery to so many families in this country in 1953 shortly after this administration came to power.

We now see residential housing starts sharply reduced, an increasingly high discount rate for mortgages eliminating many families from the housing market, an unusual difficulty on the part of small business to obtain expansion loans at moderate interest rates, a severe recession in the auto industry because, among other things, credit policies have put potential buyers out of the market.

These hardships would have been avoided had the principles of the Michigan declaration been followed.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recent events highlight the timeliness of the civil-liberties principle of the Michigan declaration issued 2 weeks ago. This is a most appropriate time to examine the conduct of loyalty, security, and suitability programs with respect to Federal employees.

The last time I looked, the Bill of Rights was still a part of our Constitution. Yet, the spirit, if not the letter, of this great charter of human rights has been ignored in the so-called security program of the present administration.

There is spread on the record of the last 3 years a shameful blot on the Federal civil service. The myth of the notorious numbers game has been exploded. False and misleading statistics, put forth by public officials, reflected on the loyalty of not only the individuals involved but our great body of civil servants. They have been exposed and proved false. Willfully or through ignorance, it was a

patent attempt to confuse loyalty, security, and unsuitability with political figures.

The technique of the "big lie" is a well-known tool of those who would destroy individual liberties.

Unfortunately, though the numbers racket is thoroughly repudiated, the harm it did is irreparable. No one knows how many innocent people will go through life under the shadow of suspicion of their loyalty—simply because of overzealous and indiscriminate labeling of all Federal employee separations in a manner reflecting on loyalty, to gain political advantage.

To achieve this result, laws enacted to protect the United States and at the same time guarantee against unjust invasion of individual rights have been maladministered. Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress is one such law. This legislation was reported by our House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Its history shows that it certainly never was intended for this purpose.

The recent Supreme Court decisions and statements of Mr. Harry P. Cain, of the Subversive Activities Control Board, are final proof of the manner in which the present administration has garbled the loyalty and security program in regard to Federal employment. The right to be heard in answer to charges and to face one's accusers is fundamental to our democratic way of life.

The administration has made no clear distinction between those separated for disloyalty, security, and unsuitability. Lasting misunderstandings have been created in the public mind and in official circles. There still exists a widespread and unhealthy state of public misconception that "security risk" and "disloyalty"—and even "unsuitability" imply one and the same thing.

To use the security program for political purposes, as the present administration has done, subverts our basic American principle of justice for the individual and raises serious concern about the future course of our country, for when justice is thrown out the window, fascism and communism are more likely to come in the door. The Federal employee security program was enacted for the protection of the Nation, not for the purpose of punishing and stigmatizing those who do not think the same as another individual or one political party. It was never meant to be the punitive law that it has become under the present administration.

I hold no brief for those who would truly endanger the security of our Nation, but we must be ever alert not to destroy our personal civil liberties by condoning the actions of the present administration in its handling of the security program. We have seen too many alarming signs that the present officials at the head of our Government appear to be more concerned with their political futures than with the basic principles upon which our country was founded. We have seen one sign in the recent action of the Post Office Department which tried to impose a gag rule, although it is now claimed to have been inadvertently done, on its employees to prevent them from exercising their rights to freedom



of speech and to petition for redress of their grievances, rights which have been guaranteed them under our Constitution. However inadvertent this may have been it reflects a basic thinking which bodes ill for the individual.

The present situation is intolerable. There may not be time remaining in this session to clean up the mess. Therefore, I strongly urge that corrective legislation for our loyalty and security program be the first order of business in the next Congress.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, speaking as a Michigan citizen and as a Representative of the Sixth District of that State, I am proud of the Michigan declaration which our distinguished colleague [Mr. DIGGS] has drawn to the attention of the House. I would like to mention one point of especial interest to me as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That is the matter of health, including mental health.

Over the Nation today there is a general recognition of the fact that we need more doctors. We hear, perhaps, of a family that cannot find a physician willing to come to their home. Perhaps we know of a community of some size, or perhaps a county, with no resident doctor at all. But, unfortunately, the typical citizen is not greatly alarmed. He may look upon certain situations as being unfortunate, but, for the most part, he puts the need for more doctors in the same class of social inconvenience as the underdevelopment of our highway system.

We ought not look on the shortage of doctors as the mere growing pains of a burgeoning civilization. The increase in the number of doctors being graduated is not keeping up with the growth of our population. At the same time, however, our need for trained medical personnel is increasing. Take, for example, the whole field of psychiatry. To be a psychiatrist, one must first be trained as a doctor of medicine. For all practical purposes we may say that there were no psychiatrists fifty years ago. Until very recently society scarcely knew how to make use of psychiatry. But, today, the field is coming into its own. Society could make good use of ten times the number of psychiatrists that we now have.

We have urgent need for doctors of medicine in the field of public health. Thousands of positions are budgeted over the country in public health for which there are no available candidates.

Consider, also, the field of industrial medicine. Large industrial concerns are coming to find more and more need for doctors in their plants—not merely to do first-aid work. That is a minor part of industrial medicine. Enlightened management wants to know scientifically the effects of certain jobs and certain working conditions on the health of workers. Management would like to know more specifically what physical tests should be given candidates for jobs. Management wants to know more about

the effect of increasing age upon the ability to do various kinds of work. In spite of the fact that there's a great new field of industrial medicine, it can scarcely be touched because of the shortage of doctors.

But perhaps the greatest increase in the need for doctors is that our population wants, and feels it is entitled to have more medical attention. Throughout most of the world today children are brought into the world with the aid of midwives. In America we take for granted the need for skilled obstetricians. When I was a boy and stepped on a rusty nail, it never occurred to do more than wash the wound and perhaps wrap a strip of cloth around my foot. Today we look for some protection against infection—perhaps even inoculation.

Each year millions of Americans are given physical examination of one kind or another by well qualified physicians—perhaps it is in connection with their jobs, or their school; perhaps it is a widespread effort to discover tuberculosis or cancer in an early stage, or perhaps it is a regular, yearly checkup so widely advocated.

So it is that we in America are constantly raising our standards of health. We feel the need for doctors of medicine in more and more ways. But despite this increasing need, there is no comparable increase in the supply of doctors. And for the foreseeable future we shall continue to see public health, industrial medicine, and psychiatry continue to be throttled—to say nothing of the increasing needs of our families. Our State and National Government should develop more medical schools to supply these pressing needs.

But I should like to draw special attention to the great national need for attention to mental health. Recently I have read that outstanding book by Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Mental Health Committee, entitled "Every Other Bed." Legislators both in the State and National Governments ought to be familiar with the message of this book. The point of the title, "Every Other Bed," is that every other hospital bed in the United States is occupied by a mental case. On the jacket of this book is the statement, carefully documented throughout the volume, that mental illness costs this country 2½ billion dollars a year. In addition many people are suffering from mental disturbance, but for whom there is no room in any mental hospital.

We now know that there are vast possibilities for improvements in the treatment of mental illness. Tens of thousands of individuals who not only suffer themselves, but whose families likewise suffer, could be relieved, if not remedied, if only we had the skilled workers and the facilities to reach them. And many more tens of thousands could undoubtedly be treated with success by methods which now lie partly discovered, and need only further research to verify, to refine, and to make available for wider use.

And this is where Government comes in. I am proud of what the Democratic Party has done in the many fields of health. Traditionally ours has been the

party of leadership in this legislation. I am glad to see in the Michigan declaration a continued concern for an ever-deepening interest and activity in this field so vital and so important to the happiness of our people.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to wholeheartedly associate myself with the statements made on the Michigan declaration by my colleague from our beloved State of Michigan.

That document is an expression of the Democratic Party of our State in the principles of the Constitution as construed by the Supreme Court, the body lawfully and constitutionally charged with the construction of that great document and the laws of our beloved country.

The Michigan declaration pledges our Democratic Party in the State of Michigan to unending efforts by constitutional and lawful means to secure full equality for all of our citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or country of origin. It further commits us to seek legislation, at the earliest date possible to implement the recent so-called school cases where the Supreme Court overthrew the separate-but-equal doctrine. Under its language, with which I completely agree, we are going to seek such other implementing legislation as will guarantee full and equal rights to all our citizens in all fields.

It is pursuant to that policy that all our delegation has signed the discharge petition recently filed by our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] to bring before this Congress H. R. 627, the civil-rights omnibus bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

But the document goes further, it appraises the world of our position on foreign affairs, the approach to the problems of the new and developing world, among them automation, and the use of the new science of the atom.

It declares that we intend to make the policy of our party to serve to the fullest the needs of all our citizens. To do this we propose more housing for our people, more and better social-security benefits for the protection of our aged, and wise, and careful use of national credit and fiscal policy which promises prosperity if wisely used.

In conclusion, I hope that all will read this document, and I hope further that the Democratic Party of the Nation, and the Congress and people of our beloved country will espouse the principles of the Michigan declaration, and use it as a guidepost for peace, prosperity, and happiness for all our citizens for all time.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HESELTON, for 20 minutes on Friday and on Tuesday of next week.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 20 minutes, on Thursday next.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KELLY of New York and include extraneous material.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. ALLEN of California and include extraneous matter.

## SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 40. An act for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 911. An act for the relief of Eftalia G. Stathis and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Zoltan Klar and his wife, Vilma Hartmann Klar, and their minor son, Tibor Klar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Salvatore di Morello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1627. An act for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1869. An act for the relief of George Papoullas and Irene Papoullas (nee Birbills); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1893. An act for the relief of Harold D. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1921. An act for the relief of Ileana Issarescu and her children, Maria Ileana Habsburg-Lothringen and Alexandra Habsburg-Lothringen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Hsu Jen-Yuan, also known as Joseph Jen-Yuan Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2229. An act for the relief of Nina Greenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2294. An act for the relief of Oscar Beregi and Margareth Leiss von Laimburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2342. An act for the relief of Yvonne Rohran (Tung) Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2530. An act to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2586. An act for the relief of Annie Feig Hildebrand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2793. An act for the relief of Wacław Tadeusz Nowosielski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2800. An act for the relief of David Chih-Wei Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2805. An act for the relief of Harriet E. Van Tassel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2827. An act for the relief of Hazel Elizabeth Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2842. An act for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2864. An act for the relief of Waltraud Grete Schramm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2943. An act for the relief of Moses Rakocinski (Rakoczynski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2954. An act for the relief of Christina Arutjunjan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2959. An act for the relief of Edith Johanna Augusta Kienest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2999. An act for the relief of Modesto Padilla-Ceja and his wife, Maria Toscano-Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3000. An act for the relief of Francesco Zammuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3009. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Kinoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3024. An act for the relief of Donald Shang-Pek Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3032. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3100. An act for the relief of Marianne Eder Dunbar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3120. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3145. An act to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3208. An act for the relief of Moses Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3212. An act for the relief of Sita Koppaka Rao and Vijayalakshmi Koppaka Rao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3235. An act for the relief of Cleopatra Vasiliades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3344. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3402. An act for the relief of Roberto C. Bargas and Rosenda C. Bargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3527. An act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 3559. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3579. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3620. An act to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 3681. An act to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3698. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3723. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land in the county of Alameda, Calif., and to accept other

land in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walrus; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3907. An act to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation to provide for certain costs of United States participation in the Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace";

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 3744. An act to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;

H. R. 4873. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended;

H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes.



## SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

- S. 872. An act for the relief of Sam Bergesen;  
 S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez;  
 S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tilbor Horvath; and  
 S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace";  
 H. R. 1402. An act for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo;  
 H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;  
 H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;  
 H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;  
 H. R. 3744. An act to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;  
 H. R. 4873. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired;  
 H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam).  
 H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;  
 H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;  
 H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended;  
 H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;  
 H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;  
 H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;  
 H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;  
 H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;  
 H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and  
 H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 14, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1962. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 17, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Ohio River and its tributaries requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 26, 1952, with a view to determining what protective works are advisable at this time to prevent further erosive action at and in the vicinity of Gallipolis, Ohio (H. Doc. No. 423); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1963. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the government of American Samoa"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1964. A letter from the Attorney General, relative to the awarding of the Young American Medal for Bravery to Miss Patricia Ann Strickland, of Atlanta, Ga., by the President of the United States at the White House on April 6, 1956, for bravery in rescuing her mother from the wreckage of a burning airplane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1965. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to additional information relating to the case of Victor Wen-Hwa Chu, A-6986548, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1966. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to an order entered in the case of Ashun Yung, A-4196469, relating to rescission of adjustment of status granted this individual, pursuant to section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1256 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1967. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 and prior fiscal years in the amount of \$3 million as increased Federal payment to the District of Columbia and \$18,358,310 out of District of Columbia funds (H. Doc. No. 424); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1968. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Army industrial fund, Maintenance and Industrial Division, Jeffersonville Quartermaster Depot, Quartermaster Corps, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1952, to March 31, 1955; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1969. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1957"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11611. A bill to pro-

vide for the establishment of the Pea Ridge National Military Park, in the State of Arkansas, without amendment (Rept. No. 2346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9591. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes, with amendment (Rept. No. 2347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 584. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Customs Court, without amendment (Rept. No. 2348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 977. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to duties of Judges of the United States Court of Claims, without amendment (Rept. No. 2349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2772. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK. Committee on the Judiciary. S. 218. An act for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex., without amendment (Rept. No. 2353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9500. A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 10184. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, Wash.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 10964. A bill to provide for municipal use of storage water in Benbrook Dam, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 11695. A bill to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions; without amendment (Rept. No. 2357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. 2352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 11740. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 11741. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 11742. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11743. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 11744. A bill to amend the act providing for the construction of the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma in order to authorize additional flood storage and pool elevations as approved by the Chief of Engineers; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 11745. A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 11746. A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 11747. A bill to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 11748. A bill to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by the Administrator of General Services under the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended, and by the Postmaster General under the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11749. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clallam County, Wash., to the State Forest Board of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 11750. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clallam County, Wash., to the State Forest Board of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 11751. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to estab-

lish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11753. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 11754. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11755. A bill to determine the need for boat basins in the Apalachicola River, Fla., in the vicinity of Bristol and in the vicinity of Blountstown; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 11756. A bill to amend the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, relating to the payment of the cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 11757. A bill to amend Public Law No. 298, 84th Congress relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Commission and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 11758. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land by the United States to the Cape Flattery School District in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 11759. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that allowances may be paid thereunder for the transportation of dependents in connection with a permanent change of station whether or not a change of residence is involved; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 11760. A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 11761. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 11762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of aiding small- and medium-sized business, encouraging industrial expansion, encouraging competition, counteracting forces growing out of the present tax structure which are bringing about widespread corporate mergers and consolidations, and for the purpose of discouraging the growing concentration of business into a few giant corporations, by substituting for the nearly uniform tax rates now applicable to corporations of vastly differing sizes a moderate graduation of tax

rates on corporate incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 11763. A bill to exempt from the tax on club dues amounts paid with respect to any nonprofit neighborhood swimming pool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 11764. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H. R. 11765. A bill to amend subchapter B of chapter 28 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 11766. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Horse Shoe Bend National Military Park, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 11767. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11768. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document No. 210 of the 83d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to review the foreign military and economic assistance programs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to review the foreign military and economic assistance programs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. Res. 536. Resolution to provide for a flag for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. Res. 537. Resolution to provide for a flag for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. Res. 538. Resolution to provide for the creation of an international food and raw materials reserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. Res. 539. Resolution establishing a flag for each Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 11769. A bill to provide for the advancement of W. O. Charles Burger, United States Army (retired), to the grade of chief warrant officer on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 11770. A bill for the relief of Way Tong Jung, Kin Koo Jung, Chor Yen Jung, Koo Ming Jung, and Poy Kee Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 11771. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine M. Castle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):

H. R. 11772. A bill for the relief of Ramon R. Minjares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11773. A bill for the relief of Pilar A. Centeno, M. D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 11774. A bill for the relief of Eric Forsyth Burtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 11775. A bill for the relief of Jose Guadalupe Gonzales Rodriguez, also known as Lupe Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11776. A bill for the relief of Maria Crocitto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11777. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Inga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11778. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 11779. A bill for the relief of Alberto Teodoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 11780. A bill for the relief of Mikiko Uemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11781. A bill for the relief of Salomon Jakab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 11782. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Prano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11783. A bill for the relief of Alphonsus Ludovicus Rosalia Van Den Bergh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 11784. A bill for the relief of Miguel Barrenechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 11785. A bill for the relief of Jang Ngoon Tom, also known as Doon Wee Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11786. A bill for the relief of Ismael Carrillo-Robles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 540. Resolution to provide for sending the bill H. R. 7740 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1136. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 241 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in favor of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1137. Also, petition of 37 persons of Greene County, Ind., in favor of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1138. By Mrs. CHURCH: Petition of the Advisory Board of Livestock Commissioners of the State of Illinois urging the Congress of the United States and the United States Department of Agriculture to locate the proposed animal disease laboratory in the State of Illinois and more specifically in the vicinity of the University of Illinois College of Veterinary Medicine and the agricultural experiment station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### The Problem of East Prussia

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian American Council in America has furnished me with the following facts which I feel are noteworthy.

In his speech of February 8, 1956, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] called attention "to one of the great tragedies and gross injustices in the wake of those agreements of Yalta and Potsdam, resulting in the present separation from Germany of East Prussia and the expulsion of its population of 2,519,000 people."

I wish to draw the attention of the House to the vital interests of one nation in the problem of East Prussia which the gentleman from Tennessee has omitted in his remarks; namely, those of the Lithuanian nation. East Prussia was, at Potsdam, not only separated from Germany, but also divided into two parts—the southern part being placed under the administration of the Polish state, the northern part under that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Although this decision was only provisional "pending the final determination of territorial questions at the peace settlement," the Soviet Government has, one-sidedly and illegally, incorporated that part of East Prussia into the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, naming it "Kaliningradskaja oblast."

Furthermore, it has completely Russified and bolshevized a territory which never belonged to Russia and was never inhabited by Russians. Having murdered, deported, and expelled that part of the original population which did not

succeed in escaping the horrors of war and Russian occupation, the Soviet Government deliberately depleted the country of a population which had been living there for centuries and, as far as the population of Lithuanian origin is concerned, even since immemorial times. This population has been replaced by Russian soldiers and settlers, forcibly driven into a country to which they have no title except that of Russian inhumanity and brutality.

This is, of course, no final settlement of the problem of the northern part of East Prussia. On the contrary, a new human and political problem of particularly great dimensions has been created which one day has to be solved at the peace settlement.

Whatever the decision may be—the solution will not be found in the maintenance of the present status or in the restoration of the status prior to World War II. The conditions have already been changed—and probably will change—too radically.

Whatever the implications and elements of the decision may be—no solution will be just and definite which satisfies only one-sided revisionistic aims of one party concerned. The solution will have to take into account the interests of all parties directly concerned with the problem. The Lithuanian nation has so definitely the most vital concern in what the final settlement of the problem is going to be.

Since immemorial times, this part of East Prussia has been inhabited by the old Prussians—Borussians—and their kinsmen, the Lithuanians. It was conquered and subjugated by the German Knights of the Order of the Cross in the 13th and 14th centuries. It was under the vassalage of Poland and the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth for 2 centuries before it became part of the German Empire.

Through many generations the Lithuanian nation was a direct and active participant in the fight of the inhabitants for their freedom and independence. By united Lithuanian and Polish forces the knights were crushingly defeated at the battle of Grunewald in 1410, which stopped the German Drangnach Osten for centuries. Subsequently Lithuania, under the leadership of its ruler Vytautas, settled her old border problem with the knights in 1422, drawing a kind of a demarcation line through Lithuanian territory which became the eastern boundary of East Prussia for 500 years until it, in 1919 at Versailles, was partly changed in favor of Lithuania; the territory north of the River Nemunas—Memel—was separated from Germany because of its still predominantly Lithuanian character and its close economic ties to Lithuania proper.

During centuries of their struggle for freedom and against slavery the old Prussians disappeared as a nation, leaving only their name to their conquerors. But the ethnic character of the northern part of East Prussia, now under Russian administration, remained Lithuanian until World War II. First in 1938, Hitler, under a supposedly final attempt to eradicate the most evident and significant proof of the Lithuanian character of the territory, changed the names of cities, localities, rivers, and so forth, into German ones.

The greater part of the territory surrounds the estuary of the River Nemunas flowing from Lithuania proper into the Baltic Sea. It connects Lithuania economically and geographically with the world. The economy of the country, its system of waterways and railway lines, is most closely connected with that of Lithuania and vice versa. It is the most vital part of Lithuania and its immediate vicinity as a geographic unit.

The problem of the northern part of East Prussia, therefore, directly affects